arXiv:0809.4775v2 [math.AP] 25 Mar 2009

ON ASYMPTOTIC STABILITY OF GROUND STATES OF NLS WITH A FINITE BANDS PERIODIC POTENTIAL IN 1D

Scipio Cuccagna and Nicola Visciglia

Abstract. We consider a nonlinear Schrödinger equation

$$iu_t - h_0 u + \beta(|u|^2)u = 0\,,\ (t,x)\in\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}$$

with $h_0 = -\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + P(x)$ a Schrödinger operator with finitely many spectral bands. We assume the existence of an orbitally stable family of ground states. Exploiting dispersive estimates in [C2,CV] and following the argument in [C1] we prove that under appropriate hypotheses the ground states are asymptotically stable.This paper is a slightly extended version of the paper to be published on the Trans. AMS.

§1 Introduction

Consider $h_0 = -\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + P(x)$ with $P(x) \equiv P(x+1)$ a smooth periodic potential of period 1 in $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and consider the NLS

$$iu_t - h_0 u + \beta(|u|^2)u = 0\,,\ (t,x)\in\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}. \tag{1.1}$$

In this paper we study the asymptotic stability of standing waves $u(t,x) = e^{it\omega}\phi_\omega(x)$ with $\phi_\omega(x) > 0$ for all x. We consider the following hypotheses. We consider the following hypotheses.

(H1) The spectrum $\sigma(h_0)$ is formed by finitely many bands. We choose h_0 so that $\inf\sigma(h_0) = 0$.

(H2) $\beta(0) = \beta'(0) = \beta''(0) = 0$, $\beta \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R})$.

(H3) There exists a $p \in (1,\infty)$ such that for every $k = 0, 1$,

$$\left|\frac{d^k}{dv^k}\beta(v^2)\right| \lesssim |v|^{p-k-1} \quad \text{if } |v| \ge 1.$$

(H4) There exists an open interval $\mathcal{O} \subseteq (0,+\infty)$ such that $h_0 u - \beta(|u|^2)u = -\omega u$ admits a C^1-family of ground states $\phi_\omega(x)$ for $\omega \in \mathcal{O}$.

(H5) $\frac{d}{d\omega}\|\phi_\omega\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} > 0$ for $\omega \in \mathcal{O}$.

Typeset by $\mathcal{A}_\mathcal{M}\mathcal{S}$-TEX

(H6) Set $L_+ = h_0 + \omega - \beta(\phi_\omega^2) - 2\phi_\omega^2 \beta'(\phi_\omega^2)$. Then $\ker(L_+) = 0$ and L_+ has exactly one negative eigenvalue, which is simple.

By [ShS] the map $\omega \to \phi_\omega \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$ is C^2 and by [We1,GSS] (H5) yields orbital stability of the ground state $e^{i\omega t}\phi_\omega(x)$. Here we investigate asymptotic stability. We need some additional hypotheses. In §2 we introduce the linearization H_ω. By standard arguments $\sigma_e(H_\omega) = \cup_\pm \pm (\omega + \sigma(h_0))$. In particular $\sigma_e(H_\omega)$ is a, finite by (H1), union of intervals. We call thresholds of H_ω the numbers in $\mathbb{R}$ which are extremes of these intervals.

(H7) Let H_ω be the linearized operator around $e^{it\omega}\phi_\omega$, see (1.3). Then H_ω has a certain number of simple positive eigenvalues with for any j: $\lambda_j(\omega) \notin \sigma_e(H_\omega)$; $2\lambda_j(\omega) \in \sigma_e(H_\omega)$ and is not a threshold. H_ω does not have other eigenvalues and each threshold of H_ω is not a resonance for H_ω.

(H8) For multi indexes $m = (m_1, m_2, ...)$ and $n = (n_1, ...)$, setting $\lambda(\omega) = (\lambda_1(\omega), ...)$ and $(m-n)\cdot\lambda = \sum (m_j - n_j)\lambda_j$, we have the following two non resonance hypotheses:
  (i) $(m-n)\cdot\lambda(\omega) = 0$ implies $m = n$ if $|m| \le 3$ and $|n| \le 3$;
  (ii) $(m-n)\cdot\lambda(\omega)$ is not a threshold of H_ω for all (m,n) with $|m| + |n| \le 3$.

(H9) We assume the non degeneracy Hypothesis 5.4.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\omega_0 \in \mathcal{O}$ and $\phi_{\omega_0}(x)$ be a ground state. Let $u(t,x)$ be a solution of (1.1). Assume (H1)–(H9). Then, there exist an $\epsilon_0 > 0$ and a $C > 0$ such that if $\inf_{\gamma \in [0,2\pi]} \|u_0 - e^{i\gamma}\phi_\omega\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, then there exist $\omega_+ \in \mathcal{O}$, $\theta \in C^1(\mathbb{R};\mathbb{R})$ and $u_+ \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$ with $\|u_+\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} \le C\epsilon$ such that*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \|u(t,\cdot) - e^{i\theta(t)}\phi_{\omega_+} - e^{-ith_0}u_+\|_{H^1} = 0.$$

Theorem 1.1 is a transposition of more general results on the NLS with $P(x) \equiv 0$ proved for 1D in [C1] and for dimensions 2 and higher in [CT,CM]. There is now a substantial literature on asymptotic stability of ground states of the NLS, which starts with work by Soffer and Weinstein [SW1-2] and Buslaev and Perelman [BP1-2] in the early 90's, see also [PW,Wd1,SW3]. In this decade we have also further work in [C4-5,TY1-3,BS,SW4,GNT,GS1-2,M1-2]. For some results on multisolitons see [P,RSS]. We highlight in particular the breakthrough work [GS2], later refined and extended in [C1,CT,CM]. The present paper and the above references focus on asymptotic stability of spatially localized standing waves of equation (1.1). For a discussion of linear and orbital stability of spatially periodic or antiperiodic standing waves see [BR,GH] and references therein.

The framework for Theorem 1.1 is, by now, classical. After breaking canonically solutions $u(t,x)$ into a ground state plus a reminder, see §2, we consider an appropriate generalized NLS for the reminder R, see (2.1). R can be decomposed using an appropriate time varying frame associated to the spectral decomposition of the linearization $H_{\omega(t)}$. Even though the spectrum of $iH_{\omega(t)}$ is on the imaginary axis, the continuous spectrum can be thought as stable spectrum. The discrete spectrum corresponds to central directions. As a general rule the main difficulty consists in showing that the discrete modes of R decay to 0, that is, in some sense, showing stability in the central manifold. The stabilization mechanism is known in various special situations and, in our opinion, is fundamentally well understood, although there are theorems yet to be proved. In particular, in the references listed at the end, the Hamiltonian structure of the NLS is not sufficiently exploited. We refer to [CM,C6] for further discussion on this theme. In this respect, the present paper presents no novelties. With hypotheses (H6-8) we consider a special case where the Hamiltonian structure of the NLS is exploited but which are already known in the literature. The novelty in this paper is that, by exploiting dispersive estimates in [C2] on e^{ith_0} and extending them to e^{itH_ω}, we are able to develop the theory of radiation in the novel context involving an NLS with a linear periodic potential. So far the literature on asymptotic stability has treated only cases $h_0 = -\partial_x^2 + P(x)$ with $P(x)$ either 0 or a short range potential, except for the special case on Lamé potentials in [C3]. We generalize considerably [C3], in particular by considering finite energy solutions in (1.1) without imposing further decay conditions at infinity for the initial datum $u_0(x)$, and by easing considerably the hypotheses on $\beta(|u|^2)$. Furthermore, [C3] treats only 2 bands potentials while in this paper h_0 can have any finite number of bands. To prove Theorem 1.1 we need to use as [M1-2] smoothing estimates, see also the elaborations [C1,CT]. To prove Stricharz estimates with Birman-Solomjak rather than Lebesgue spaces, we need to adapt a well known lemma due to Christ and Kiselev [CK], see Lemma 3.1 [SmS].

It would be interesting to consider the case when $\sigma(h_0)$ has infinitely many bands, but in that case H_ω can have infinitely many eigenvalues, a situation we avoid by assuming that $\sigma(h_0)$ has finitely many bands. Theorem 1.1 can be generalized, see [CM], assuming:

(H7') H_ω has a certain number of simple positive eigenvalues such that for any j there an $N_j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that:

$\ell\lambda_j(\omega) \notin \sigma_e(H_\omega)$ for all $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $0 \le \ell \le N_j$; $(N_j + 1)\lambda_j(\omega) \in \sigma_e(H_\omega)$ but is not a threshold of H_ω. H_ω does not have other eigenvalues and each threshold of H_ω is not a resonance. We set $N = \max_j N_j$.

(H8') For multi indexes $m = (m_1, m_2, ...)$ and $n = (n_1, ...)$, setting $\lambda(\omega) = (\lambda_1(\omega), ...)$ and $(m-n)\cdot\lambda = \sum(m_j - n_j)\lambda_j$, we have the following two non resonance hypotheses:
  (i) $(m-n)\cdot\lambda(\omega) = 0$ implies $m = n$ if $|m| \le N+2$ and $|n| \le N+2$;
  (ii) $(m-n)\cdot\lambda(\omega)$ is not a threshold of H_ω. H_ω for all (m,n) with $|m| + |n| \le N+2$.

(H9') There is an appropriate substitute of Hypothesis 4.4 and we replace Lemma 4.3 with an appropriate hypothesis, see Hypothesis 4.4 [C6].

We remark that [C1] revises [C7] but is quite different from [C7]. In [C7] Lemma 5.4 is wrong. Notice that the material in §5 [C7] can be saved proceeding as in the present paper.

Notation. For $s \in \mathbb{R}$, $\|u\|_{L^{p,s}_x} := \|\langle x\rangle^s u\|_{L^p_x}$. In particular $L^p_x = L^{p,0}_x$. We set

$\langle f, g\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} {}^t f(x)\overline{g(x)}dx$, with $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ column vectors, ${}^tA$ the transpose and $\overline{g}$ the complex conjugate of g. Sometimes we write $\langle f, g\rangle_x$ or $\langle f, g\rangle_t$ to emphasize the variable of integration. We write $\langle f, g\rangle_{sx} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} {}^t f(s, x)\overline{g(s, x)}dsdx$. Given $x \in \mathbb{R}$ set $x^+ = x\vee 0$ and $x^- = (-x)\vee 0$. $R_H(z) = (H-z)^{-1}$. $W^{k,p}(\mathbb{R})$ is the space of tempered distributions $f(x)$ such that $(1 - \partial_x^2)^{k/2}f \in L^p(\mathbb{R})$. $\mathbb{R}^- = (-\infty, 0)$, $\mathbb{R}^+ = (0, \infty)$. Given two functions $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ with values in $\mathbb{C}^2$, whose elements are column vectors, then their Wronskian is the scalar $W[f, g](x) = {}^tf'(x)g(x) - {}^tf(x)g'(x)$. A pair (r, p) of numbers is said to be admissible if $(r, p) \in [4,\infty] \times [2,\infty]$ with $2/r = 1/2 - 1/p$. We set $\overrightarrow{e}_1 = {}^t(1, 0)$ and $\overrightarrow{e}_2 = {}^t(0, 1)$. Set diag (a, b) for the diagonal 2×2 matrix with (a, b) on the diagonal. Given a metric space X, $k \in X$ and $S \subseteq X$, we denote the distance of k from S by $\mathrm{dist}(k, S)$. For a pair of Banach spaces X and Y we denote by $B(X, Y)$ the Banach space of bounded linear operators from X to Y. $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is the space of Schwarz functions.

§2 LINEARIZATION, MODULATION AND SET UP

We will use the following classical result, [We1,GSS1-2]:

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose that $e^{i\omega t}\phi_\omega(x)$ satisfies (H1-6) and $\phi_\omega(x) > 0$ for all x. Then $\exists\, \epsilon > 0$ and a $A_0(\omega) > 0$ such that for any $\|u(0, x) - \phi_\omega\|_{H^1_x} < \epsilon$ we have for the corresponding solution* $\inf\{\|u(t, x) - e^{i\gamma}\phi_\omega(x)\|_{H^1_x} : \gamma \in \mathbb{R}\} < A_0(\omega)\epsilon$.

Setting $u(t, x) = e^{i\Theta(t)}(\phi_{\omega(t)}(x) + r(t, x))$, $\Theta(t) = \int_0^t \omega(s)ds + \gamma(t)$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} ir_t &= h_0r + \omega(t)r - \beta(\phi^2_{\omega(t)})r - \beta'(\phi^2_{\omega(t)})\phi^2_{\omega(t)}r \\ &- \beta'(\phi^2_{\omega(t)})\phi^2_{\omega(t)}\overline{r} + \dot\gamma(t)\phi_{\omega(t)} - i\dot\omega(t)\partial_\omega\phi_{\omega(t)} + \dot\gamma(t)r + n(r, \overline{r})\end{aligned}$$

for $n(r, \overline{r}) = O(r^2)$, $\overline{n(r, \overline{r})} = n(\overline{r}, r)$. Set ${}^tR = (r, \overline{r})$, ${}^t\Phi_\omega = (\phi_\omega, \phi_\omega)$. Given $\sigma_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, $\sigma_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & i \\ -i & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, $\sigma_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$, we write

$$H_\omega = \sigma_3\left[h_0 + \omega - \beta(\phi^2_\omega) - \beta'(\phi^2_\omega)\phi^2_\omega\right] + i\sigma_2\beta'(\phi^2_\omega)\phi^2_\omega.$$

The equation (1.1) is Hamiltonian, because there is a real valued function $F(|u|^2)$ with $\beta(|u|^2)u = \partial_{\overline{u}}(F(|u|^2))$ and $F(0) = 0$. Then $-n(r, \overline{r}) = \partial_{\overline{r}}G(R)$ with $G(R)$ real valued, $G(0) = 0$. For ${}^tG'(R) = (G_r, G_{\overline{r}})$ we rewrite the above equation as

$$iR_t = H_\omega R + \sigma_3\dot\gamma R + \sigma_3\dot\gamma\Phi - i\dot\omega\partial_\omega\Phi + \sigma_3\sigma_1G'(R). \tag{2.1}$$

Set $H_0(\omega) = \sigma_3(h_0 + \omega)$ and $V(\omega) = H_\omega - H_0(\omega)$. The essential spectrum is

$$\sigma_e = \sigma_e(H_\omega) = \sigma_e(H_0(\omega)) = \cup_\pm \pm(\sigma(h_0) + \omega).$$

0 is an isolated eigenvalue. Given an operator L we set $N_g(L) = \cup_{j\geq 1}N(L^j)$ and $N(L) = \ker L$. [We2] implies that, if $\{\cdot\}$ means span, $N_g(H^*_\omega) = \{\Phi, \sigma_3\partial_\omega\Phi\}$.

For each j we consider a generator $\xi_j \in \ker(H_\omega - \lambda_j)$ such that $\langle \xi_j, \sigma_3 \xi_j \rangle = 1$. We expand $R(t) \in N_g^\perp(H^*_{\omega(t)})$ into

$$R(t) = (z \cdot \xi + \bar{z} \cdot \sigma_1 \xi) + f(t) \in \big[\sum_{j,\pm} \ker(H_{\omega(t)} \mp \lambda_j(\omega(t))) \big] \oplus L_c^2(H_{\omega(t)}). \tag{2.2}$$

Correspondingly we express (2.1) as

(2.3)

$$\begin{aligned} i\dot{z}_j \xi_j - \lambda_j(\omega) z_j \xi_j &= P_{\ker(H_\omega - \lambda_j)} (\dot{\gamma}(\omega, R) \sigma_3 R + \sigma_3 \sigma_1 G'(R) \\ &\quad - i z_j \dot{\omega}(\omega, R) \partial_\omega \xi_j + i \dot{\omega}(\omega, R) \partial_\omega P_{\ker(H_\omega - \lambda_j)} R) \\ i P_c(H_\omega) \dot{f} - H_\omega f &= P_c(H_\omega)(\dot{\gamma}(\omega, R) \sigma_3 R + \sigma_3 \sigma_1 G'(R) + i \dot{\omega}(\omega, R) \partial_\omega P_c(H_\omega) R). \end{aligned}$$

§3 SPACETIME ESTIMATES FOR H_ω

We list a number of linear estimates needed in the stability argument.

Lemma 3.1 (dispersive estimates). *There exists a projection* $\pi_\omega : L^2_x \to L^2_x$ *with* $[\pi_\omega, H_\omega] = 0$, *such that if we set* $\mathcal{U}(t) = \pi_\omega e^{itH_\omega} P_c(H_\omega)$ *and* $\mathcal{V}(t) \equiv (1 - \pi_\omega) e^{itH_\omega} P_c(H_\omega)$, *then we have for* $C(\omega) > 0$ *semicontinuous in* ω *and for all* $t \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\|\mathcal{U}(t)\|_{B(L^1_x, L^\infty_x)} \le C \langle t \rangle^{-\frac{1}{3}} \text{ and } \|\mathcal{V}(t)\|_{B(L^1_x, L^\infty_x)} \le C |t|^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

The proof is sketched in §9.

For every $1 \le p, q \le \infty$ we introduce the Birman-Solomjak spaces

$$\ell^p(\mathbb{Z}, L^q_t[n, n+1]) \equiv \left\{ f \in L^q_{loc}(\mathbb{R}) \text{ s.t. } \{\|f\|_{L^q[n,n+1]}\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \in \ell^p(\mathbb{Z}) \right\},$$

endowed with the norms

$$\begin{aligned} &\|f\|^p_{\ell^p(\mathbb{Z}, L^q_t[n,n+1])} \equiv \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \|f\|^p_{L^q_t[n,n+1]} \quad \forall \quad 1 \le p < \infty \text{ and } 1 \le q \le \infty \\ &\|f\|_{\ell^\infty(\mathbb{Z}, L^q_t[n,n+1])} \equiv \sup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \|f\|_{L^q_t[n,n+1]}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have:

Lemma 3.2 (Strichartz estimates). *There exists a constant* $C = C(\omega)$ *upper semicontinuous in* ω *such that for any* $k \in [0, 2]$ *and for every admissible pair* (r, p) *we have:*

$$\|\mathcal{U}(t) f\|_{\ell^{\frac{3}{2} r}(\mathbb{Z}, L^\infty_t([n,n+1], W^{k,p}_x))} \le C \|f\|_{H^k_x} \tag{1}$$

$$\|\mathcal{V}(t) f\|_{L^r_t(\mathbb{R}, W^{k,p}_x)} \le C \|f\|_{H^k_x}. \tag{2}$$

For any two admissible pairs $(r_1, p_1), (r_2, p_2)$ *we have:*

$$\left\| \int_0^t \mathcal{U}(t-s)g(s)ds \right\|_{\ell^{\frac{3}{2}r_1}(\mathbb{Z}, L_t^\infty([n,n+1], W_x^{k,p_1})} \leq C\|g\|_{\ell^{\left(\frac{3}{2}r_2\right)'}(\mathbb{Z}, L_t^1([n,n+1], W_x^{k,p_2'})} \tag{3}$$

$$\left\| \int_0^t \mathcal{V}(t-s)g(s)ds \right\|_{L_t^{r_1}(\mathbb{R}, W_x^{k,p_1})} \leq C\|g\|_{L_t^{r_2'}(\mathbb{R}, W_x^{k,p_2'})}. \tag{4}$$

Lemma 3.2 is a consequence of Lemma 3.1 and an adapted TT^* argument, see Lemma 3.1 [C1] and see §9 for the proof.

In §7 we prove the following Kato smoothness result:

Lemma 3.3. *Fix* $\tau > 3/2$*, then:*

(1) there exists $C = C(\tau, \omega)$*, upper semicontinuous in* ω *such that for any* $\varepsilon \neq 0$

$$\|R_{H_\omega}(\lambda + i\varepsilon)P_c(H_\omega)u\|_{L^2_\lambda L_x^{2,-\tau}} \leq C\|u\|_{L_x^2};$$

(2) for any $u \in L_x^{2,\tau}$ *the following limits exist*

$$\lim_{\epsilon \searrow 0} R_{H_\omega}(\lambda \pm i\varepsilon)u = R^\pm_{H_\omega}(\lambda)u \textit{ in } C^0(\sigma_e(H_\omega), L_x^{2,-\tau});$$

(3) we have

$$\|R^\pm_{H_\omega}(\lambda)P_c(H_\omega)\|_{B(L_x^{2,\tau}, L_x^{2,-\tau})} < C\langle\lambda\rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}};$$

(4) given any $u \in L_x^{2,\tau}$ *we have*

$$P_c(H_\omega)u = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{\sigma_e(H_\omega)} (R^+_{H_\omega}(\lambda) - R^-_{H_\omega}(\lambda))u \, d\lambda.$$

Claim (1) is proved as inequality (4) in Proposition 7.1. Claim (2) is proved as formula (12) in Proposition 7.1. Claim (3) is a consequence of the proof in Proposition 7.1. The limiting absorption principle Claim (4) is Lemma 7.6 below.

Lemma 3.4. *For any* k *and* $\tau > 3/2$ $\exists$ $C = C(\tau, k, \omega)$ *upper semicontinuous in* ω *such that:*

(a) for any $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$*,*

$$\|e^{-itH_\omega}P_c(H_\omega)f\|_{L_t^2 H_x^{k,-\tau}} \leq C\|f\|_{H_x^k};$$

(b) for any $g(t,x) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^2)$

$$\left\| \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{itH_\omega}P_c(H_\omega)g(t,\cdot)dt \right\|_{H_x^k} \leq C\|g\|_{L_t^2 H_x^{k,\tau}}.$$

Proof. By Proposition 7.1 below, it is enough to prove Lemma 3.4, as well as Lemmas 3.5-6 below, for $k = 0$. (a) implies (b) by duality:

$$\begin{aligned} &|\langle f, \sigma_3 \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{itH_\omega} P_c(\omega) g(t) dt\rangle_x| = |\langle \langle x\rangle^{-\tau} e^{-itH_\omega} P_c(H_\omega) f, \sigma_3 \langle x\rangle^{\tau} g\rangle_{t,x}| \\ &\le \|e^{-itH_\omega} P_c(H_\omega) f\|_{L^2_t L^{2,-\tau}_x} \|g\|_{L^2_t L^{2,\tau}_x} \le \|f\|_{L^2_x} \|g\|_{L^2_t L^{2,\tau}_x}. \end{aligned}$$

We now prove (a) for $k = 0$. Let $g(t,x) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with $g(t) = P_c(H_\omega) g(t)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle e^{-itH_\omega} f, \sigma_3 g\rangle_{t,x} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi i}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left\langle (R^+_{H_\omega}(\lambda) - R^-_{H_\omega}(\lambda)) f, \sigma_3 \overline{\widehat{g}}(\lambda) \right\rangle_x d\lambda \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi i}} \int_{\sigma_e(H_\omega)} \left\langle (R^+_{H_\omega}(\lambda) - R^-_{H_\omega}(\lambda)) f, \sigma_3 \overline{\widehat{g}}(\lambda) \right\rangle_x d\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Then from Fubini and Plancherel and by (1) Lemma 3.3 we have

$$\left|\langle e^{-itH_\omega} f, \sigma_3 g\rangle_{t,x}\right| \le \|(R^+_{H_\omega}(\lambda) - R^-_{H_\omega}(\lambda)) f\|_{L^{2,-\tau}_x L^2_\lambda(\sigma_e(H_\omega))} \|g\|_{L^{2,\tau}_x L^2_t}.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(R^+_{H_\omega}(\lambda) - R^-_{H_\omega}(\lambda)) f\|_{\ell^{2,-\tau} L^2_\lambda(\sigma_e(H_\omega))} = \\ &\lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \|(R_{H_\omega}(\lambda + i\varepsilon) - R_{H_\omega}(\lambda - i\varepsilon)) f\|_{\ell^{2,-\tau} L^2_\lambda(\sigma_e(H_\omega))}. \end{aligned}$$

It is enough to prove Lemma 3.4 for $f = P_c(H_\omega) f$. Then

$$\|R_{H_\omega}(\lambda + i\varepsilon) f\|_{\ell^{2,-\tau} L^2_\lambda(\sigma_e(H_\omega))} \le C \|f\|_{\ell^2}$$

for any $\epsilon \neq 0$ and fixed C follows from inequality (4) in the proof of Proposition 8.1 below.

Lemma 3.5. *For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\tau > 3/2$ $\exists$ $C = C(\tau, k, \omega)$ such that $\forall$ $g(t,x) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^2)$*

$$\left\| \int_0^t e^{-i(t-s)H_\omega} P_c(H_\omega) g(s, \cdot) ds \right\|_{L^2_t H^{k,-\tau}_x} \le C \|g\|_{L^2_t H^{k,\tau}_x}.$$

Proof. By Plancherel and Hölder inequalities and by (3) Lemma 3.3 we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\| \int_0^t e^{-i(t-s)H_\omega} P_c(H_\omega) g(s, \cdot) ds \|_{L^2_t L^{2,-\tau}_x} \\ &\le \|R^+_{H_\omega}(\lambda) P_c(H_\omega) \widehat{\chi}_{[0,+\infty)} *_\lambda \widehat{g}(\lambda, x)\|_{L^2_\lambda L^{2,-\tau}_x} \\ &\le \left\| \|R^+_{H_\omega}(\lambda) P_c(H_\omega)\|_{B(L^{2,\tau}_x, L^{2,-\tau}_x)} \|\widehat{\chi}_{[0,+\infty)} *_\lambda \widehat{g}(\lambda, x)\|_{L^{2,\tau}_x} \right\|_{L^2_\lambda} \\ &\le \|R^+_{H_\omega}(\lambda) P_c(H_\omega)\|_{L^\infty_\lambda(\mathbb{R}, B(L^{2,\tau}_x, L^{2,-\tau}_x))} \|g\|_{L^2_t L^{2,\tau}_x} \le C \|g\|_{L^2_t L^{2,\tau}_x}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.6. *For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\tau > 3/2$ $\exists$ $C = C(\tau, k, \omega)$ such that $\forall$ $g(t,x) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^2)$*

$$\left\| \int_0^t \mathcal{U}(t-s) g(s,\cdot) ds \right\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2 \cap \ell^6(\mathbb{Z}, L_t^\infty([n,n+1], W_x^{k,\infty}))} \le C \|g\|_{L_t^2 H_x^{k,\tau}} \tag{1}$$

$$\left\| \int_0^t \mathcal{V}(t-s) g(s,\cdot) ds \right\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2 \cap L_t^4 W_x^{k,\infty})} \le C \|g\|_{L_t^2 H_x^{k,\tau}}. \tag{2}$$

Proof. For $g(t,x) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ set

$$T_1 g(t) = \int_0^{+\infty} \mathcal{U}(t-s) g(s) ds \text{ and } T_2 g(t) = \int_0^{+\infty} \mathcal{V}(t-s) g(s) ds.$$

Lemma 3.4 (b) implies $f := \int_0^{+\infty} e^{isH_\omega} P_c(H_\omega) g(s) ds \in L_x^2$. So in particular $\pi_\omega f$ and $(1-\pi_\omega) f$ belong to L_x^2. For (r,p) admissible we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\|T_1 g(t)\|_{\ell^{\frac{3}{2}r}(\mathbb{Z}, L_t^\infty([n,n+1], L_x^p))} \lesssim \|\pi_\omega f\|_{L_x^2} \lesssim \|g\|_{L_t^2 L_x^{2,\tau}} \\ &\|T_2 g(t)\|_{L_t^r L_x^p} \lesssim \|(1-\pi_\omega) f\|_{L_x^2} \lesssim \|g\|_{L_t^2 L_x^{2,\tau}}. \end{aligned}$$

We get as a direct consequence of [CK], Lemma 3.1 [SmS]:

$$\left\| \int_0^t \mathcal{V}(t-s) g(s) ds \right\|_{L_t^r L_x^p} \lesssim \|g\|_{L_t^2 L_x^{2,\tau}}.$$

Our next claim is that

$$\left\| \int_0^t \mathcal{U}(t-s) g(s) ds \right\|_{\ell^{\frac{3}{2}r}(\mathbb{Z}, L_t^\infty([n,n+1], L_x^p))} \lesssim \|g\|_{L_t^2 L_x^{2,\tau}}.$$

For $(r,p) = (\infty, 2)$ this follows from [CK]. The case $(r,p) = (4, \infty)$ follows from an extension of to Birman-Solomjak spaces of the result in [CK] which we prove in section 10.

§4 Nonlinear argument for system (2.3)

We use the multi index notation $z^m = \prod_j z_j^{m_j}$. We consider the Taylor expansion

$$\sigma_3 \sigma_1 G'(R) = \sum_{|m+n|=2}^{3} R_{m,n}(\omega) z^m \bar{z}^n + \sum_{|m+n|=1} z^m \bar{z}^n A_{m,n}(\omega) f + O(f^2) + \cdots$$

with $R_{m,n}(\omega, x)$ and $A_{m,n}(\omega, x)$ real vectors and matrices exponentially decreasing in x. We have

$$A_{m,n}(\omega) = \frac{\sigma_3\sigma_1}{m!n!}\partial_z^m \partial_{\overline{z}}^n \partial_f G'(0)\,, \quad R_{m,n}(\omega) = \frac{\sigma_3\sigma_1}{m!n!}\partial_z^m \partial_{\overline{z}}^n G'(0).$$

We set $\delta_j = (\delta_{j1}, \delta_{j2}, ...)$ with δ_{jk} the Kronecker delta. We have

$$A_{\delta_\ell,0}(\omega) = \sigma_3\sigma_1\partial_{z_\ell}\partial_f G'(0) = \sigma_3\sigma_1\partial_{z_\ell}\partial_f G'(0) = \sigma_3\sigma_1 G^{(3)}(0)(\cdot, \xi_\ell, P_c(H_\omega))$$

where $G^{(3)}(0)$ is written as a symmetric trilinear form and where one of the vectors of the triple is ξ_ℓ. We have

$$\begin{aligned} P_c(H_\omega)R_{\delta_j+\delta_\ell,0}(\omega) &= \frac{\sigma_3\sigma_1}{(\delta_j+\delta_\ell)!}P_c(H_\omega^*)\partial_{z_j}\partial_{z_\ell}G'(0) \\ = \frac{\sigma_3\sigma_1}{(\delta_j+\delta_\ell)!}\partial_{z_j}\partial_{z_\ell}G'(0)\circ P_c(H_\omega) &= \frac{\sigma_3\sigma_1}{(\delta_j+\delta_\ell)!}G^{(3)}(0)(\xi_j, \xi_\ell, P_c(H_\omega)). \end{aligned}$$

For $O_{loc}(z^n) = \sum_\ell O_{loc}(|z_\ell^n|)$, (2.1) can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} if_t = \left(H_{\omega(t)} + P_c(H_\omega)\sigma_3\dot{\gamma}\right) f + \sum_{|m+n|=2} z^m \overline{z}^n P_c(H_\omega)R_{m,n}(\omega) \\ + \sum_{|m+n|=1} z^m \overline{z}^n P_c(H_\omega)A_{m,n}(\omega)f + O(f^2) + O_{loc}(z^3), \end{aligned} \tag{4.1a}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} i\dot{z}_j\xi_j - \lambda_j(\omega)z_j\xi_j = P_{\ker(H_\omega-\lambda_j)}\Big(\sum_{|m+n|=2} z^m \overline{z}^n R_{m,n}(\omega) \\ + \sum_{|m+n|=3} z^m \overline{z}^n R^{(1)}_{m,n}(\omega) + \sum_{|m+n|=1} z^m \overline{z}^n A_{m,n}(\omega)f\Big) + O(f^2) + O_{loc}(z^4) \end{aligned} \tag{4.1b}$$

with the $A_{m,n}(\omega)$ and $R_{m,n}(\omega)$ the same of the expansion of $\sigma_3\sigma_1 G'(R)$ and with the $R^{(1)}_{m,n}(\omega)$ real and exponentially decreasing vectors. We have:

Lemma 4.1. *For any* $C_1 > 0$ $\exists$ $\epsilon(C_1) > 0$ *and* $C(C_1)$ *such that if, for* $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon(C_1)$*, we have* $\|z_j\|_{L^\infty(0,T)} + \|z_j\|^2_{L^4(0,T)} \le C_1\epsilon$ *for all* j*, then*

$$\|f\|_{L^2_t((0,T),H_x^{1,-2})} + \|f\|_{L^6_t((0,T),L^\infty_x)\cap L^\infty_t((0,T),H^1_x)} < C(C_1)\epsilon.$$

Proof. Notice that $\sum_j \|z_j\|_{L^\infty_t} + \|f\|_{L^\infty_t H^1_x} < c_0\epsilon$ for a fixed c_0 is a consequence of orbital stability, Theorem 2.1 above. In this proof we set $P_c(\omega) = P_c(H_\omega)$. We split $P_c(\omega) = P_+(\omega) + P_-(\omega)$, with $P_\pm(\omega)$ the spectral projections in $\mathbb{R}_\pm \cap \sigma_e(H_\omega)$, see Lemma 8.13 below. We now rewrite the equation for f. By orbital stability, Theorem 2.1, we can fix ω_0 such that $|\omega(t) - \omega_0| = O(\epsilon)$ for all t. Following [BP2] we set

$$\begin{aligned}
&if_t = \{H_{\omega_0} + (\dot\gamma + \omega - \omega_0)(P_+(\omega_0) - P_-(\omega_0))\} P_c(\omega_0) f \\
&+ O_{loc}(\epsilon f) + O(f^2) + O_{loc}(z^2) \\
&\text{where } O_{loc}(\epsilon f) = (\dot\gamma + \omega - \omega_0) \left(P_c(\omega_0)\sigma_3 - (P_+(\omega_0) - P_-(\omega_0)) \right) f \\
&+ (V(\omega) - V(\omega_0)) f + (\dot\gamma + \omega - \omega_0) \left(P_c(\omega) - P_c(\omega_0) \right) \sigma_3 f.
\end{aligned}$$

with $V(\omega)$ the localized matrix potential defined under (2.1) and where the notation $O_{loc}(\epsilon f)$ is justified by the fact that $\omega - \omega_0 = O(\epsilon)$ and for any pair $s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ there is $c_{s_1,s_2}(\omega)$ upper semicontinuous in ω, see Lemma 8.13, such that for $j = 0, 1$

$$\|P_c(\omega)\sigma_3 - (P_+(\omega) - P_-(\omega))\|_{H_x^{j,s_1} \to H_x^{j,s_2}} \le c_{s_1,s_2}(\omega) < \infty$$

where the case $j = 1$ follows from $j = 0$ applying H_ω and interpolating. We have $\|f\|_{L_t^6((0,T),L_x^\infty)} \approx \|P_c(\omega_0)f\|_{L_t^6((0,T),L_x^\infty)}$ by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|f\|_{L_t^6((0,T),L_x^\infty)} = \|P_c(\omega_0)f\|_{L_t^6((0,T),L_x^\infty)} + \|\left(P_c(\omega) - P_c(\omega_0)\right) f\|_{L_t^6((0,T),L_x^\infty)} \\
&= \|P_c(\omega_0)f\|_{L_t^6((0,T),L_x^\infty)} + O(\epsilon)\|f\|_{L_t^6((0,T),L_x^\infty)}
\end{aligned}$$

For

$$U_\pm(t,t') = e^{-i(t-t')H_{\omega_0}} e^{\pm i \int_{t'}^t d\tau (\dot\gamma(\tau) + \omega(\tau) - \omega_0)} P_\pm(\omega_0), \tag{4.2}$$

we have

$$P_\pm(\omega_0) f(t) = U_\pm(t,0) f(0) + \int_0^t U_\pm(t,t')(O_{loc}(\epsilon f) + O(f^2) + O_{loc}(z^2)) dt'.$$

We set $O_{loc}(\epsilon f) + O(f^2) + O_{loc}(z^2) = \mathcal{X} + O(f^7)$. Let $\pi = \pi_{\omega_0}$ be the projection in Lemmas 3.1-2 and $\pi_1 = 1 - \pi$. By (1)–(2) Lemma 3.2 and interpolation we have for a fixed $c_0(\omega_0)$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|U_\pm(t,0)f(0)\|_{L_t^6((0,T),L_x^\infty)} \le \|U_\pm(t,0)f(0)\|_{L_t^6 L_x^\infty} \lesssim \\
&\|U_\pm(t,0)\pi f(0)\|_{\ell^6(\mathbb{Z}, L_t^\infty([n,n+1],L_x^\infty))} + \|U_\pm(t,0)\pi_1 f(0)\|_{L_t^4 L_x^\infty}^{\frac{2}{3}} \\
&\times \|U_\pm(t,0)\pi_1 f(0)\|_{L_t^\infty H_x^1}^{\frac{1}{3}} \le c_0(\omega_0)\|f(0)\|_{H_x^1} \le c_0(\omega_0)\epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, by (3)–(4) Lemma 3.2 and interpolation we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\| \int_0^t U_\pm(t,t')O(f^7)dt'\right\|_{L^6_t((0,T),L^\infty_x)} \lesssim \left\| \int_0^t U_\pm(t,t')\pi_1 O(f^7)dt'\right\|^{\frac{2}{3}}_{L^4_t((0,T),L^\infty_x)} \\ &\times \left\| \int_0^t U_\pm(t,t')\pi_1 O(f^7)dt'\right\|^{\frac{1}{3}}_{L^\infty_t((0,T),H^1_x)} \\ &+ \left\| \chi_{[0,T]} \int_0^t U_\pm(t,t')\pi O(f^7)dt'\right\|_{\ell^6(\mathbb{Z},L^\infty_t([n,n+1],L^\infty_x))} .\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.2 both terms in the right are bounded by $\|O(f^7)\|_{L^1_t((0,T),H^1_x)}$. So by Lemma 3.2 and Hölder inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\| \int_0^t U_\pm(t,t')O(f^7)dt'\right\|_{L^6_t((0,T),L^\infty_x)} \le c_0 \|O(f^7)\|_{L^1_t((0,T),H^1_x)} \\ &\lesssim \|f\|^6_{L^6_t((0,T),L^\infty_x)} \|f\|_{L^\infty_t(0,T)H^1_x} \lesssim \epsilon^7 .\end{aligned}$$

In a similar fashion, by Lemma 3.6 and by (1) below we have

$$\left\| \int_0^t U_\pm(t,t')\mathcal{X} dt'\right\|_{L^6_t((0,T),L^\infty_x)} \le c_0(\omega) \|\mathcal{X}\|_{L^2_t((0,T),H^{1,2}_x)} \lesssim \epsilon^2 .$$

We claim we have

$$\|\mathcal{X}\|_{L^2_t H^{1,2}_x} \le C(\omega)\left(\epsilon^2 + \|f\|^2_{L^2_t H^{1,-2}_x}\right). \tag{1}$$

Indeed $\mathcal{X} = O_{loc}(\epsilon f) + O_{loc}(zf) + O_{loc}(f^2) + O_{loc}(z^2)$ with

$$\|O_{loc}(\epsilon f)\|_{H^{1,2}_x L^2_t} \lesssim \epsilon \|f\|_{L^2_t H^{1,-2}_x} ; \quad \|O_{loc}(zf)\|_{H^{1,2}_x L^2_t} \lesssim \|z\|_\infty \|f\|_{L^2_t H^{1,-2}_x};$$

$$\|O_{loc}(f^2)\|_{L^2_t H^{1,2}_x} \lesssim \|f\|^2_{L^2_t H^{1,-2}_x} ; \quad \|O_{loc}(|z|^2)\|_{H^{1,2}_x L^2_t} \lesssim \epsilon \|z^2\|_{L^2_t} \lesssim \epsilon^2 .$$

Hence (1) is correct. Let now $f = g + h$ with

$$\begin{aligned}&ig_t = \{H_{\omega_0} + \ell(t)(P_+(\omega_0) - P_-(\omega_0))\} g + \mathcal{X} , \quad g(0) = f(0) \\ &ih_t = \{H_{\omega_0} + \ell(t)(P_+(\omega_0) - P_-(\omega_0))\} h + O(f^7) , \quad h(0) = 0.\end{aligned}$$

Then, by Lemmas 3.4 and 3.5 we get for a fixed c_0

$$\|g\|_{L^2_t((0,T),H^{1,-2}_x)} \lesssim c_0(C_1+1)\epsilon + O(\epsilon^2) \le C(C_1)\epsilon .$$

Finally by Lemma 3.4

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^T \|e^{-i(t-s)H_{\omega_0}} e^{\pm i\int_s^t \ell(\tau)d\tau} O(f^7)(s)\|_{L^2_t((0,T),H^{1,-2}_x)}\\ &\lesssim \int_0^T \|O(f^7)(s)\|_{H^1_x} ds \lesssim \epsilon^7.\end{aligned}$$

This yields $\|h\|_{L^2_t((0,T),H^{1,-2}_x)} \lesssim \epsilon^7$ and completes the proof of Lemma 4.1.

Having obtained Lemma 4.1, we rewrite (4.1a) in the form

$$\begin{aligned}&if_t = \{H_{\omega_0} + (\dot\gamma + \omega - \omega_0)(P_+(\omega_0) - P_-(\omega_0))\} f\\ &+ \sum_{|m+n|=2} z^m \bar z^n P_c(\omega_0) R_{m,n}(\omega) + \sum_{|m+n|=1} z^m \bar z^n P_c(\omega_0) A_{m,n}(\omega) f +\\ &+ (\dot\gamma + \omega - \omega_0)\left(P_c(\omega_0)\sigma_3 - (P_+(\omega_0) - P_-(\omega_0))\right) f + (V(\omega) - V(\omega_0)) f\\ &+ (\dot\gamma + \omega - \omega_0)\left(P_c(\omega) - P_c(\omega_0)\right)\sigma_3 f + O(f^2) + O_{loc}(z^3)\\ &+ (P_c(\omega) - P_c(\omega_0))\left(\sum_{|m+n|=2} z^m \bar z^n R_{m,n}(\omega) + \sum_{|m+n|=1} z^m \bar z^n A_{m,n}(\omega) f\right).\end{aligned}$$

We then set

$$f_2 = f + \sum_{|m+n|=2} R^+_{H_{\omega_0}}((m-n)\cdot\lambda(\omega_0)) P_c(H_{\omega_0}) R_{m,n}(\omega) z^m \bar z^n. \tag{4.3}$$

We will need below:

Lemma 4.2. *Assume the hypotheses of Lemma 4.1. Then for $s > 1$ sufficiently large we can decompose $f_2 = h_1 + h_2 + h_3 + h_4$ with:*

(1) *for a fixed $c_0(\omega_0)$,* $\|h_1\|_{L^2_t L^{2,-s}_x} \le c_0(\omega_0)\|f(0)\|_{H^1} \le c_0(\omega_0)\epsilon$;

(2) *for a fixed $c_1(\omega_0)$,* $\|h_2\|_{L^2_t L^{2,-s}_x} \le c_1(\omega_0)|z(0)|^2 \le c_1(\omega_0)\epsilon^2$;

(3) $\|h_3\|_{L^2_t L^{2,-s}_x} = O(\epsilon^2)$;

(4) $\|h_4\|_{L^2_t L^{2,-s}_x} = O(\epsilon^2)$.

Proof. The proof is basically that in §4 [CM]. We have schematically

$$\begin{aligned}&i\partial_t P_c(H_{\omega_0}) f_2 = \left(H_{\omega_0} + (\dot\gamma + \omega - \omega_0)(P_+(\omega_0) - P_-(\omega_0))\right) P_c(H_{\omega_0}) f_2 +\\ &+ \sum_{|m+n|=2} O(|z|^3)\ R^+_{H_{\omega_0}}((m-n)\cdot\lambda(\omega_0) R_{m,n}(\omega_0)\\ &+ P_c(H_{\omega_0})\left(o(1) O_{loc}(|z|^2) + o(1) O_{loc}(f) + O(f^2)\right).\end{aligned}$$

For $h_1(0) = f(0)$ let

$$i\partial_t(h_1 + h_2) = (H_{\omega_0} + (\dot\gamma + \omega - \omega_0)(P_+ - P_-))(h_1 + h_2), \quad h_1(0) + h_2(0) = f_2(0).$$

Then (1) follows by Lemma 3.3 applied to $P_\pm(\omega_0)h_1(t) = U_\pm(t,0)f(0)$, with $U_\pm(t,s)$ defined in Lemma 4.1. To get (2) we observe that for a constant $C = C(\Lambda, \omega_0)$ upper semicontinuous in ω_0 and in $\Lambda > \omega_0$ we have

$$\|U_\pm(t,t')R^+_{H_\omega}(\Lambda)P_c g\|_{L^{2,-s}_x} < C\langle t - t'\rangle^{-\frac{3}{2}}\|g\|_{L^{2,s}_x}, \; s > s_0. \tag{5}$$

The weighted estimate (5) can be proved proceeding along the lines of the proof of Theorem 2.4 in pp. 135–6 [C3] using the estimates for the Jost functions in Lemma 9.1 and the representation in Lemma 9.11. Then (5) implies (2) by $f_2(0) = \sum_{|m+n|=2} R^+_{H_{\omega_0}}((m-n)\lambda(\omega_0))R_{m,n}(\omega_0)z^m(0)\bar z^n(0)$. Next we define $h_3(0) = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &i\partial_t P_c(H_{\omega_0})h_3 = (H_{\omega_0} + (\dot\gamma + \omega - \omega_0)(P_+(\omega_0) - P_-(\omega_0)))\,P_c(H_{\omega_0})h_3 + \\ &+ P_c(H_{\omega_0})\left(O(\epsilon)O_{loc}(|z|^2) + O(\epsilon)O_{loc}(f) + O(f^2)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Then (3) follows from the argument in Lemma 4.1. Finally we set $h_4(0) = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &i\partial_t h_4 = (H_{\omega_0} + (\dot\gamma + \omega - \omega_0)(P_+(\omega_0) - P_-(\omega_0)))\,h_4 \\ &+ \sum_{|m+n|=2} O(|z|^3)R^+_{H_{\omega_0}}((m-n)\cdot\lambda(\omega_0))R_{m,n}(\omega_0). \end{aligned}$$

Then we have $h_4 = \sum_\pm h_{4\pm}$ with

$$h_{4\pm}(t) = \sum_{|m+n|=2}\int_0^t U_\pm(t,t')O(|z(s)|^3)R^+_{H_{\omega_0}}((m-n)\cdot\lambda(\omega_0))R_{m,n}(\omega_0)dt'.$$

By (5) we get $\|h_{4\pm}(t)\|_{L^{2,-s}_x} \le C\epsilon\int_0^t\langle t - t'\rangle^{-\frac{3}{2}}|z(t')|^2dt'$ and so $\|h_4\|_{L^2_tL^{2,-s}_x} \le \epsilon\|z\|^2_{L^4_t} = O(\epsilon^2)$. This concludes the proof of Lemma 4.2.

By substitution of (4.3) in (4.1b) we get

$$\begin{aligned} &i\dot z_j\xi_j - \lambda_j(\omega)z_j\xi_j = P_{\ker(H_\omega - \lambda_j)}\Big(\sum_{|m+n|=2} z^m\bar z^n R_{m,n}(\omega) + \sum_{|m+n|=3} z^m\bar z^n R^{(1)}_{m,n}(\omega) \\ &- \sum_{|m'+n'|=1}\sum_{|m+n|=2} z^{m+m'}\bar z^{n+n'}A_{m',n'}(\omega)R^+_{H_{\omega_0}}((m-n)\cdot\lambda(\omega_0))P_c(H_\omega)R_{m,n}(\omega) \\ &+ \sum_{|m+n|=1} z^m\bar z^n A_{m,n}(\omega)f_2 + O(f^2) + O_{loc}(z^4). \end{aligned}$$

Here recall $P_{\ker(H_\omega-\lambda_j)}=\xi_j\langle\quad,\sigma_3\xi_j\rangle$. By standard normal forms arguments there exists a change of variables $\zeta_j=z_j+\sum_{|m+n|=2}^{3}p_{j,m,n}(\omega)z^m\overline{z}^n$ with $\Im p_{j,m,n}=0$ for $|m+n|=2$ such that below we have $\Im a_{j,\ell}(\omega)=0$ and

$$
\begin{aligned}
&i\dot{\zeta}_j\xi_j-\lambda_j(\omega)\zeta_j\xi_j=\xi_j\sum_\ell a_{j,\ell}(\omega)|\zeta_\ell|^2\zeta_j+O_{loc}(\zeta f_2)+O(f^2)+O_{loc}(\zeta^4)\\
&-\sum_\ell|\zeta_\ell|^2\zeta_jP_{\ker(H_\omega-\lambda_j)}A_{0,\delta_\ell}(\omega)R^+_{H_{\omega_0}}(\lambda_\ell(\omega_0)+\lambda_j(\omega_0))P_c(H_\omega)R_{\delta_\ell+\delta_j,0}(\omega)
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.4}
$$

where $O_{loc}(\zeta^nf_2)=\sum_\ell O_{loc}(\zeta_\ell^nf_2)$. Applying $\langle\quad,\sigma_3\xi_j\rangle$ to (4.4) we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
&i\dot{\zeta}_j-\lambda_j(\omega)\zeta_j=\sum_\ell a_{j,\ell}(\omega)|\zeta_\ell|^2\zeta_j+\langle O_{loc}(\zeta f_2)+O(f^2)+O_{loc}(\zeta^4),\sigma_3\xi_j\rangle-\\
&-\sum_\ell|\zeta_\ell|^2\zeta_j\langle A_{0,\delta_\ell}(\omega)R^+_{H_{\omega_0}}(\lambda_\ell(\omega_0)+\lambda_j(\omega_0))P_c(H_\omega)R_{\delta_\ell+\delta_j,0}(\omega),\sigma_3\xi_j\rangle.
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.5}
$$

Recall that $\Im a_{j,\ell}(\omega)=0$. Then multiplying (4.5) by $\overline{\zeta}_j$ we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}|\zeta_j|^2=&-\sum_\ell\left(\Gamma_{j,\ell}(\omega_0)+o(1)\right)|\zeta_\ell|^2|\zeta_j|^2+\\
&+\Im[\overline{\zeta_j}\langle O_{loc}(\zeta f_2)+O(f^2)+O_{loc}(\zeta^4),\sigma_3\xi_j\rangle]
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.6}
$$

where we use $\omega-\omega_0=O(\epsilon)$,

$$\Gamma_{j,\ell}(\omega)=\Im\langle A_{0,\delta_\ell}(\omega)R^+_{H_\omega}(\lambda_\ell(\omega)+\lambda_j(\omega))P_c(H_\omega)R_{\delta_\ell+\delta_j,0}(\omega),\sigma_3\xi_j(\omega)\rangle$$

and the continuous dependence in ω of $A_{0,\delta_\ell}(\omega)$, $R_{\delta_\ell+\delta_j,0}(\omega)$ and $P_c(H_\omega)$. We have:

Lemma 4.3. *We have for* $h_{j,\ell}(\omega)=\sigma_3\sigma_1G^{(3)}(0)(\xi_j,\xi_\ell,P_c(H_\omega))$

$$\Gamma_{j,\ell}(\omega)=\frac{\pi}{(\delta_j+\delta_\ell)!}\langle\delta(H_\omega-\lambda_j-\lambda_\ell)h_{j,\ell}(\omega),\sigma_3h_{j,\ell}(\omega)\rangle\geq 0.$$

The proof is in Lemma 3.4 [C6]. We assume the following, which by $2\lambda_j(\omega)>\omega$ for any j looks like a generic condition:

Hypothesis 4.4. *We suppose that* $\Gamma_{j,j}(\omega)>0$ *for any* j .

Integrating (4.6) in an interval $[0,t]$ we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
&C_0\sum_j\int_0^t|\zeta_j|^4+\sum_j|\zeta_j(t)|^2/2\leq\\
&\leq\sum_j|\zeta_j(0)|^2/2+c_1\left(\sum_j\int_0^t|\zeta_j|^4\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\|f_2\|_{L^2_tL^{2,-s}_x}+O(\epsilon^3).
\end{aligned}
$$

By Lemma 4.2, $\|f_2\|_{L^2_t L^{2,-s}_x} \le c_2\epsilon$ for $c_2 \approx 1$. Then for a fixed $c \approx 1$

$$\sum_j \int_0^t |z_j|^4 + \sum_j |z_j(t)|^2 \le c\,\epsilon^2.$$

The proof that, for ${}^t f(t) = (h(t), \overline{h}(t))$, $h(t)$ is asymptotically free for $t \to \infty$, is similar to the analogous one in [CM]. For $U_\pm(t,t')$ defined in (4.2) we have for $t_1 < t_2$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|U(0,t_2)f(t_2) - U(0,t_1)f(t_1)\|_{H^1_x} \le \\
&\le \|U_\pm(0,t')(O_{loc}(\epsilon f) + O(f^2) + O_{loc}(z^2))\|_{L^1((t_1,t_2),H^1_x)} \lesssim \\
&\|f\|_{L^2((t_1,t_2),H^{1,-2}_x} + \|f\|_{L^6((t_1,t_2),L^\infty_x} + |z|_{L^4(t_1,t_2)} \to 0 \text{ for } t_1 \to \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Then consider $w_+ = P_+(\omega_0)w + P_-(\omega_0)w$ with $P_\pm(\omega_0)w = \lim_{t\to\infty} U_\pm(0,t)f(t)$. We have

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \|P_c(\omega_0)f(t)\|_{L^{2,-2}_x} = \lim_{t\to\infty} \|(U_+(t,0) + U_-(t,0))P_c(\omega_0)f(0)\|_{L^{2,-2}_x} = 0$$

with the second equality true for any $f(0) \in H^1$. For $P_d(\omega) = 1 - P_c(\omega)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|P_c(\omega_0)f(t) - f(t)\|_{H^1} =& \|(P_d(\omega) - P_d(\omega_0))f\|_{L^2_x} \\
\lesssim& |\omega - \omega_0| \|P_c(\omega_0)f(t)\|_{L^{2,-2}_x} \lesssim \|P_c(\omega_0)f(t)\|_{L^{2,-2}_x} \to 0,
\end{aligned}$$

as $t \to \infty$. Combining the above we have for $\theta(t) = \int_0^t d\tau(\dot\gamma(\tau) + \omega(\tau))$

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \|f(t) - e^{i[(t\omega_0 - \theta(t) + \theta(0)](P_+(\omega_0) - P_-(\omega_0))} e^{-itH_{\omega_0}} w_+\|_{H^1_x} = 0.$$

Consider the strong limit $W(\omega_0) = \lim_{t\nearrow\infty} e^{itH_{\omega_0}} e^{-it(h_0+\omega_0)\sigma_3}$ and set

$$R_+ = W(\omega_0)^{-1} e^{i\theta(0)(P_+(\omega_0) - P_-(\omega_0))} w_+.$$

Notice that since $e^{it\omega_0\sigma_3}$ is a unitary matrix periodic in t and $e^{it\omega_0\sigma_3}R_+$ describes circle in L^2_x, we have

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty} \|e^{-itH_{\omega_0}} W(\omega_0) e^{it\omega_0\sigma_3} R_+ - e^{-it(h_0+\omega_0)\sigma_3} e^{it\omega_0\sigma_3} R_+\|_{H^1_x} = 0.$$

Since $W(\omega_0)$ conjugates H_{ω_0} into $\sigma_3(h_0 + \omega_0)$, we get

$$e^{(it\omega_0 + i\theta(0))(P_+(\omega_0) - P_-(\omega_0))} e^{-itH_{\omega_0}} w_+ = e^{-itH_{\omega_0}} W(\omega_0) e^{it\omega_0\sigma_3} R_+.$$

Hence the last two limits and the definition of R_+ imply the limit

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty}\left\|e^{i\theta(t)\sigma_3}f(t)-e^{-ith_0\sigma_3}R_+\right\|_{H^1_x}=0.$$

Since $R(t)=\sum_j(z_j(t)\xi_j(\omega(t))+\overline{z}_j(t)\sigma_1\xi_j(\omega(t)))+f(t)$ and since $\lim_{t\nearrow\infty}z_j(t)=0$, it follows that

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty}\left\|e^{i\theta(t)\sigma_3}R(t)-e^{-ith_0\sigma_3}R_+\right\|_{H^1_x}=0. \tag{1}$$

Finally, by the same argument of [BP2,BS,CM] $\lim_{t\nearrow\infty}\omega(t)=\omega_+$ for some ω_+. Hence expressing (1) in components we obtain Theorem 1.1.

§5 Review on Bloch functions for h_0

By hypothesis for $\sigma(h_0)$ there exist $A_0^\pm=0<A_1^-<A_1^+<...<A_{n_0}^-<A_{n_0}^+<\infty$ such that

$$\sigma(h_0)=\cup_{j=0}^{n_0-2}[A_j^+,A_{j+1}^-]\cup[A_{n_0}^+,\infty).$$

The sets (A_j^-,A_j^+) for $j=1,...,n_0$ are nonempty spectral gaps. For $j\geq 0$ we set $a_j^\pm=\sqrt{A_j^\pm}$. For $j\leq 0$, $a_j^\pm=-a_{-j}^\pm$. For any $E\in\mathbb{C}\backslash[0,\infty)$ there is a unique $k\in\mathbb{C}_+$, called quasimomentum such that $h_0u=Eu$ has a solution of the form $\widetilde{\phi}_\pm(x,k)=e^{\pm ikx}\widetilde{m}_\pm(x,k)$ with $\widetilde{m}_\pm(x+1,k)\equiv\widetilde{m}_\pm(x,k)$ and $\widetilde{m}_\pm(0,k)=1$. The correspondence $E\to k(E)$ is a conformal map from $\mathbb{C}\backslash[0,\infty)$ into a set

$$\mathcal{K}=\mathbb{C}_+\backslash(\cup_{j=1}^{n_0}([n(j)\pi,n(j)\pi+ih_j]\cup[-n(j)\pi,-n(j)\pi+ih_j])$$

with $n(j)$ strictly increasing for $j=1,..,n_0$ and $h_j>0$. We set $\mathcal{T}=\{\pm\pi n(j):j=1,...,n_0\}$. The inverse map $E=E(k)$ extends in an even map $\mathbb{R}\backslash\mathcal{T}\to\sigma(h_0)$. We have

$$E(\pi n(j)\pm 0):=\lim_{\varepsilon\searrow 0}E(n(j)\pi\pm\varepsilon)=\pi A_j^\pm.$$

$E(k)$ defined in $]\pi n(j),\pi n(j+1)[$ extends continuously in $[\pi n(j),\pi n(j+1)]$. Same holds for $[\pi n(n_0),\infty)$. We consider the solutions $\theta(x,k)$ and $\varphi(x,k)$ of $h_0u=E(k)u$ which satisfy the initial conditions $\varphi(0,k)=\theta'(0,k)=0$ and $\varphi'(0,k)=\theta(0,k)=1$. Then

$$\tilde{\phi}_\pm(x,k)=\theta(x,k)+m^\pm(k)\varphi(x,k)\text{ with }m^\pm(k)=\frac{\varphi'(1,k)-\theta(1,k)}{2\varphi(1,k)}\pm i\frac{\sin k}{\varphi(1,k)}.$$

For real $k\in\mathbb{R}\backslash\mathcal{T}$ we have $\widetilde{\phi}_\pm(x,k)=\overline{\widetilde{\phi}_\mp(x,k)}$. Set now

$$N^2(k)=\int_0^1\tilde{\phi}_+(x,k)\tilde{\phi}_-(x,k)dx.$$

Then $N^2(k) > 0$ for $k \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\mathcal{T}$, with $N^2(k)$ bounded away from 0 near $\mathcal{T}$, and $N^2(k) \neq 0$ for all $k \in \mathcal{K}$, see for instance §2 [C2]. Then there is an $a > 0$ such that there is a well defined holomorphic square root $N(k)$ for $k \in \mathcal{K}$ with $\Im k < a$. Notice that the restriction $\Im k < a$ is due to monodromy issues. We extend $N(k) \neq$ also for $\Im k \geq a$, possibly as a discontinuous function. Then we introduce functions $m^0_\pm(x,k) = \tilde{m}^0_\pm(x,k)/N(k)$ and $\phi^0_\pm(x,k) := e^{\pm ikx} m^0_\pm(x,k)$. The following fact is well known.

Theorem 5.1. *The functions $\phi^0_\pm(x,k)$ are analytic in $k \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\mathcal{T}$ and for $\mathcal{F}_{h_0} f(k) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi^0_+(x,k) f(x) dx$ we have:*

$$(a) \qquad \int_{\mathbb{R}} |f(y)|^2 dy = \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\mathcal{F}_{h_0} f(k)|^2 dk;$$

$$(b) \qquad f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi^0_-(x,k) \mathcal{F}_{h_0} f(k) dk;$$

$$(c) \qquad \mathcal{F}_{h_0}(h_0 f)(k) = E(k) \mathcal{F}_{h_0} f(k) \text{ for } k \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\mathcal{T};$$

$$(d) \qquad e^{ith_0}(x,y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i(tE(k)-(x-y)k)} m^0_-(x,k) m^0_+(y,k) dk.$$

In the sequel $\dot{g}(k) = \partial_k g(k)$. Korotyaev [K] proves:

Lemma 5.2. *Consider $E(k)$ for $k \in [\pi n(j), \pi n(j+1)]$. Then $\dot{E}(k) = 0$ for $k = n(j)\pi, n(j+1)\pi$ and $\dot{E}(k) > 0$ in $]\pi n(j), \pi n(j+1)[$. In $[\pi n(j), \pi n(j+1)]$ the equation $\ddot{E}(k) = 0$ admits exactly one solution k_j. We have $k_j \in]\pi n(j), \pi n(j+1)[$ and $\dddot{E}(k_j) \neq 0$. We have $\dot{E}(k) > 0$ in $]\pi n(n_0), \infty)$ and $\ddot{E}(k) > c_0 > 0$ in $[\pi n(n_0), \infty)$ for some $c_0 > 0$.*

Notice that $E(-k) = E(k)$.

Theorem 5.3. *Set $e^{ith_0}(x,y) = \mathcal{U}(t,x,y) + \mathcal{V}(t,x,y)$ with*

$$\mathcal{U}(t,x,y) = \int_{|k| \leq \pi n(n_0)} e^{i(tE(k)-(x-y)k)} m^0_-(x,k) m^0_+(y,k) dk$$
$$\mathcal{V}(t,x,y) = \int_{|k| \geq \pi n(n_0)} e^{i(tE(k)-(x-y)k)} m^0_-(x,k) m^0_+(y,k) dk.$$

Then $|\mathcal{U}(t,x,y)| \leq C\langle t\rangle^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ and $|\mathcal{V}(t,x,y)| \leq C|t|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$.

Assuming Lemma 5.4 below, the proof is in [F1]. In [C2] Theorem 5.3 is extended to the case of infinitely many energy bands. In the case of finitely many energy bands we have:

Lemma 5.4. *For all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ there are constants $C_\alpha > 0$ such that for $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and for $k \neq \pm n(j)\pi$, $j = 1, ..., n_0$, we have*

$$\left|\partial_k^\alpha (m_+^0(x,k) m_-^0(y,k) - 1)\right| \leq C_\alpha \langle k \rangle^{-1-\alpha}.$$

Proof (sketch). Cases $\alpha = 0, 1$ are stated and proved in [C2] in the case of a generic periodic potential $P(x)$, i.e. all gaps non empty. The case with finitely many bands is much easier. In the finite bands case, there is an $M > 0$ such that the $\alpha = 0$ case is valid for all complex k with $|k| \geq M$. Here we are using the fact that $m_+^0(x,k)m_-^0(y,k)$ is holomorphic in $\mathcal{K} \cup \mathcal{K})^* \cup (\mathbb{R}\backslash \mathcal{T})$, see [C2] and where $z \in \mathcal{K}^*$ if and only if $\overline{z} \in \mathcal{K}$. The inequalities for $\alpha \geq 1$ hold by the Cauchy integral formula.

In the sequel we will set $w_0(k) = W[\phi_+^0(x,k), \phi_-^0(x,k)]$.

Lemma 5.5. *For $k \neq \pm n(j)\pi$, $j = 1, ..., n_0$ we have $\dot{E}(k) = -iw_0(k)$.*

Proof. The formula $\dot{E}(k) = \frac{2\sin(k)}{\varphi(1,k)N^2(k)}$ is formula (3.1) [F2]. By direct computation $W[\widetilde{\phi}_+^0(k), \widetilde{\phi}_-^0(k)] = i\frac{2\sin(k)}{\varphi(1,k)}$. So Lemma 5.5 follows by the normalization in the definition of $\phi_\pm^0(x,k)$.

§6 ADDITION TO h_0 OF A SMALL POTENTIAL $q(x) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$

We consider the operator $h = h_0 + q(x)$ with $q(x) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ small. We consider solutions $f_\pm(x,k) = e^{\pm ikx} m_\pm(x,k)$ of $hu = E(k)u$ with

$$\lim_{x \to +\infty} \frac{m_+(x,k)}{m_+^0(x,k)} = 1 = \lim_{x \to -\infty} \frac{m_-(x,k)}{m_-^0(x,k)}. \tag{6.1}$$

Lemma 6.1. *Assume that $q(x) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$. Then for any $k \in \mathcal{K}$ the equation*

$$m_\pm(x,k) = m_\pm^0(x,k) - \int_x^{\pm\infty} e^{\mp ik(x-t)} A(x,t,k) q(t) m_\pm(t,k) dt, \tag{6.2}$$

$$\text{with } A(x,t,k) := \frac{\phi_+^0(x,k)\phi_-^0(t,k) - \phi_-^0(x,k)\phi_+^0(t,k)}{W[\phi_+^0(\cdot,k), \phi_-^0(\cdot,k)]}, \tag{6.3}$$

has a unique solution $m_\pm(x,k)$ such that $f_\pm(x,k) = e^{\pm ikx} m_\pm(x,k)$ solves $hu = E(k)u$ with the asymptotic property in (6.1). There is a constant C_q such that for some $a > 0$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|m_\pm(x,k) - m_\pm^0(x,k)| \le C_q \langle k\rangle^{-1} \max(1, \mp x) \\
&\left|\partial_k^n m_\pm(x,k)\right| \le C_q \langle k\rangle^{-1} \max{}^{n+1}(1,\mp x) \text{ for } n=1,2 \text{ and } \Im k < a.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.4}
$$

Furthermore we have continuous extensions for $k \in [\pi n(j), \pi n(j+1)]$*, for* $k \in [\pi n(n_0), \infty)$*, for* $k \in [-\pi n(j+1), -\pi n(j)]$ *and for* $k \in (-\infty, -\pi n(n_0)]$ *where the above estimates continue to be satisfied.*

Notice that estimates for $f_\pm(x,k)$ are also in [F2]. Set

$$D_k(x,t) = A(x,t,k)e^{-ik(x-t)} = \frac{m_+^0(x,k)m_-^0(t,k) - e^{-2ik(x-t)}m_-^0(x,k)m_+^0(t,k)}{W[\phi_+^0(x,k), \phi_-^0(x,k)]}.$$

Then Lemma 6.1 follows from standard arguments, see Lemma 1 [DT], by the following lemma:

Lemma 6.2. *Let* $t \ge x$*. Then we have the following for a fixed* $C > 0$*:*

(1) $|D_k(x,t)| \le C\langle k\rangle^{-1}$ *for* $|k| \ge \pi n(n_0) + 1$ *;*

(2) $|D_k(x,t)| \le C\langle x-t\rangle$*;*

(3) $|\dot{D}_k(x,t)| \le C\langle x-t\rangle^2$ *for* $\dot{D}_k(x,t) = \partial_k D_k(x,t)$*;*

(4) $|\ddot{D}_k(x,t)| \le C\langle x-t\rangle^3$ *for* $\ddot{D}_k(x,t) = \partial_k^2 D_k(x,t)$*.*

(1) follows from Lemma 5.4 which yields a bound $|m_\pm^0(x,k)m_\mp^0(t,k)| \le C$ for a fixed C and $w_0(k) \approx 2ik$ for $|k| \nearrow \infty$. $w_0(k) = 0$ iff $k = k_0 \pm 0$ for $k_0 \in \mathcal{T}$. By Lemmas 5.2 and 5.5 $\dot{w}_0(k_0 \pm 0) \ne 0$. So $|w_0(k)| \gtrsim \operatorname{dist}(k, \mathcal{T})$. For fixed $t \ge x$ consider $x_1, t_1 \in [0,2]$ with $0 \le t_1 - x_1 \le t - x$ and $t - x = t_1 - x_1 + L$ with $L \in \mathbb{N}$. Then we can set $D_k(x,t) = D_k^{(1)}(x,t) + D_k^{(2)}(x,t)$ with

$$
\begin{aligned}
D_k^{(1)}(x,t) &= \frac{m_+^0(x_1,k)m_-^0(t_1,k) - e^{2ik(t_1-x_1)}m_-^0(x_1,k)m_+^0(t_1,k)}{w_0(k)} \\
D_k^{(2)}(x,t) &= e^{2ik(t_1-x_1)}\frac{1-e^{2ikL}}{w_0(k)} m_-^0(x_1,k)m_+^0(t_1,k).
\end{aligned}
$$

$D_k^{(2)}(x,t)$ satisfies (1)–(4). Indeed Lemma 5.4 yields bounds on $m_-^0(x_1,k)m_+^0(t_1,k)$. Similarly, one can bound $\frac{1-e^{2ikL}}{w_0(k)}$ using $|w_0(k)| \gtrsim \operatorname{dist}(k,\mathcal{T})$ and the fact that, for k near $k_0 \in \mathcal{T}$, then $w_0(k)$ for $k \ge k_0$ resp. for $k \le k_0$ admits an analytic extension defined around k_0, see [C2,F1,F2,K]. Finally we claim that $|\partial_k^n D_k^{(1)}(x,t)| \le C$ for $|n| \le 2$ and a fixed C. For k large this is a consequence of $w_0(k) = i\dot{E}(k) \approx 2ik$ and the estimates on $E(k)$, see [K], and Lemma 5.4. For $k_0 \in \mathcal{T}$ and $k_0^\pm = k_0 \pm 0$

$$e^{ik_0x}m_+^0(x,k_0^+) \equiv e^{-ik_0x}m_-^0(x,k_0^+) \text{ and } e^{ik_0x}m_+^0(x,k_0^-) \equiv e^{-ik_0x}m_-^0(x,k_0^-).$$

Then both numerator and denominator in the fraction defining $D_k^{(1)}(x,t)$ are 0 for $k = k_0 \pm 0$ with $k_0 \in \mathcal{T}$. Since, once again, these are functions admitting analytic extensions on fixed neighborhoods around k_0, one obtains the desired estimates $|\partial_k^n D_k^{(1)}(x,t)| \le C$.

Lemma 6.3. *There exists $q(x) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ so that for all $k \in \mathcal{T}$ with $k > 0$ we have*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} q(x)|m_+^0(x,0)|^2 dx > 0 \tag{1}$$

$$\mp \int_{\mathbb{R}} q(x)|m_+^0(x,k \pm 0)|^2 dx > 0 \text{ for all } k \in \mathcal{T} \text{ with } k > 0. \tag{2}$$

Proof. $m_+^0(x,k \pm 0) \not\equiv 0$ for all $k \in \mathcal{T}$. Since $\sigma(h_0)$ has finitely many bands, the potential $P(x)$ is analytic, and hence also the $m_\pm^0(x,k)$ are analytic in x. (2) can fail if and only if $|m_+^0(\cdot,k_1+0)| = |m_+^0(\cdot,k_2-0)|$ for two $k_1, k_2 \ge 0$ in $\mathcal{T}$. The latter is the same of $|\phi_+^0(\cdot,k_1+0)| = |\phi_+^0(\cdot,k_2-0)|$. Notice that $E(k_1+0) \ne E(k_2-0)$, so one of them is nonzero. It is not restrictive to assume $E(k_2-0) > 0$. Notice that $\phi_+^0(x,k_1+0)$ and $\phi_+^0(x,k_2-0)$ are real valued for $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Indeed, for instance, by definition $\overline{\widetilde{\phi}_+^0(x,k_1+0)} = \widetilde{\phi}_-^0(x,k_1+0)$, see (2.5) [C2], $w_0(k_1+0) = 0$ implies $\widetilde{\phi}_+^0(x,k_1+0) = C\widetilde{\phi}_-^0(x,k_1+0)$ for a fixed C and by definition $\widetilde{\phi}_+^0(0,k_1+0) = \widetilde{\phi}_-^0(0,k_1+0) = 1$. By $E(k_2-0) > 0$ the function $\phi_+^0(x,k_2-0)$ has infinitely many zeros (if it has 1 it has infinitely many since $\phi_+^0(x,k_2-0) = e^{ik_1x}m_+^0(x,k_2-0)$ with $m_+^0(x,k_2-0)$ periodic in x, if it had none $\phi_+^0(x,k_2-0)$ would correspond to $E(k_2) = 0$). We choose two points $a < b$ with $\phi_+^0(a,k_2-0) = \phi_+^0(b,k_2-0) = 0$ and $\phi_+^0(x,k_2-0) \ne 0$ for $a < x < b$. $|\phi_+^0(\cdot,k_1+0)| = |\phi_+^0(\cdot,k_2-0)|$ implies the same statement for $\phi_+^0(x,k_1+0)$. But then they are both ground states for the Dirichlet problem in $[a,b]$ for the operator h. Then $\phi_+^0(x,k_1+0) = C\phi_+^0(x,k_2-0)$ for fixed C, but this is impossible by $E(k_1+0) \ne E(k_2-0)$.

We pick $q(x) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ small as in Lemma 6.3. By [FK] we have that $\sigma(h) = \sigma(h_0)$, and in particular h has no eigenvalues. Furthermore there are no resonances, that is there are not nonzero solutions of any of the equations $hu = A_j^\pm u$ for $j > 0$ with $u \in L^\infty$. Combining the asymptotics in Lemma 6.1 and the analysis of the thresholds in [FK] we conclude:

Lemma 6.4. *For the Wronskian we have $W[f_+(k), f_-(k)] \ne 0$ for all k and $W[f_+(k), f_-(k)] \approx 2ik$ for $|k| \to \infty$.*

There are equalities

$$
\begin{aligned}
&f_{\mp}(x,k)=\frac{R_{\pm}(k)}{T(k)}f_{\pm}(x,k)+\frac{1}{T(k)}f_{\pm}(x,-k)\\
&\overline{f_{\pm}(x,k)}=f_{\pm}(x,-k)\,,\ \overline{T(k)}=T(-k)\,,\ \overline{R_{\pm}(k)}=R_{\pm}(-k)\\
&|T(k)|^2+|R_{\pm}(k)|^2=1\,,\quad T(k)\overline{R_{\pm}}(k)+R_{\mp}(k)\overline{T(k)}=0
\end{aligned}
\tag{6.6}
$$

with $T(k)$ and $R_{\pm}(k)$ smooth functions for $k\in\mathbb{R}\backslash\mathcal{T}$ with smooth extensions in $[\pi n(j),\pi n(j+1)]$, $[\pi n(n_0),\infty)$, $[-\pi n(j+1),-\pi n(j)]$ and $(-\infty,-\pi n(n_0)]$ and with $T(k)=0$ for all $k\in\mathcal{T}$ and $T(0)=0$. For $q(x)$ small

$$
\left|[T(k)-1]^{(m)}\right|+\left|R_{\pm}^{(m)}(k)\right|\le\delta/\langle k\rangle \text{ for } |m|\le 2. \tag{6.7}
$$

Next define

$$
\psi(x,k)=\begin{cases}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}T(k)f_{+}(x,k) & \text{for}\quad k\ge 0\\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}T(-k)f_{-}(x,-k) & \text{for}\quad k<0\end{cases} \tag{6.8}
$$

Then by standard arguments (partially repeated in the proof of Lemma 8.12) we have the following version of Theorem 5.1 for h.

Lemma 6.5. *For $\mathcal{F}_h f(k):=\int_{\mathbb{R}}\psi(x,k)f(x)dx$ we have*

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(a)\qquad \int_{\mathbb{R}}|f(y)|^2dy=\int_{\mathbb{R}}|\mathcal{F}_hf(k)|^2dk\\
&(b)\qquad f(x)=\int_{\mathbb{R}}\overline{\psi(x,k)}\mathcal{F}_hf(k)dk\\
&(c)\qquad \mathcal{F}_h\left(hf\right)(k)=E(k)\mathcal{F}_hf(k)\\
&(d)\qquad e^{ith}(x,y)=\int_{\mathbb{R}}e^{itE(k)}\overline{\psi(x,k)}\psi(y,k)dk.
\end{aligned}
$$

We have:

Lemma 6.6 (dispersive estimates). *Set $e^{ith}(x,y)=\mathcal{U}(t,x,y)+\mathcal{V}(t,x,y)$ with*

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{U}(t,x,y)&=\int_{|k|\le\pi n(n_0)}e^{itE(k)}\overline{\psi(x,k)}\psi(y,k)dk\\
\mathcal{V}(t,x,y)&=\int_{|k|\ge\pi n(n_0)}e^{itE(k)}\overline{\psi(x,k)}\psi(y,k)dk.
\end{aligned}
$$

Then $|\mathcal{U}(t,x,y)| \le C\langle t\rangle^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ *and* $|\mathcal{V}(t,x,y)| \le C|t|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ *for a fixed* $C > 0$.

For $\mathcal{U}(t,x,y)$ the argument is the same of Theorem 5.3. Turning to $\mathcal{V}(t,x,y)$, the proof follows along the lines of Lemmas 2.4 and 2.5 in [Wd2] using [C2], so we give a short sketch only. Let $\varsigma(k)$ the characteristic function of the set $|k| \ge \pi n(n_0)$. Set $\phi_\pm(t,x,y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^\pm} e^{itE(k)}\overline{\psi(x,k)}\psi(y,k)\varsigma(k)dk$. Split $\phi_\pm = \phi_\pm^{low} + \phi_\pm^{high}$ distinguishing large and small k in the integral. To fix ideas let us consider only $\phi(t,x,y) = 2\pi\phi_+^{high}(t,x,y) = 2\pi\int_{\mathbb{R}^+} e^{itE(k)}\overline{\psi(x,k)}\psi(y,k)\varphi(k)dk$ with φ a smooth increasing function equal to 0 near $\pi n(n_0)$ and equal to 1 near $+\infty$. It is not restrictive to assume $x < 0$ and $y > 0$ since with different signs we can use (6.6) as in [Wd2]. Then $\phi = \phi_1 + \phi_2$ with the ϕ_j defined below. We have $\phi_1 = \phi_1^{(0)} + \phi_1^{(1)}$ with

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_1^{(0)}(t,x,y) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} e^{itE(k)+ik(x-y)} m_-^0(x,k)m_+^0(y,k)\varphi(k)dk\\ \phi_1^{(1)}(t,x,y) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} e^{itE(k)+ik(x-y)} m_-^0(x,k)m_+^0(y,k)\varphi(k)(|T(k)|^2-1)dk.\end{aligned}$$

The proof of $|\phi_1^{(0)}(t,x,y)| \le Ct^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ follows from the arguments in the proof of Lemma 4.3 in [C2] which in part we repeat now to prove $|\phi_1^{(1)}(t,x,y)| \le Ct^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. We extend $E(k)$ outside the support of φ so that is a strictly convex smooth even function on $\mathbb{R}$. Let $p(k) = E(k) + ikt^{-1}(x-y)$. Let k_0 be the unique solution of $\dot{p}(k) = 0$. For $\chi(t)$ a cutoff supported near $t = 0$, we insert the partition of unity $\chi(k-k_0) + (1-\chi(k-k_0))$. Correspondingly set $\phi_1^{(1)} = \phi_1^{(1,1)} + \phi_1^{(1,2)}$ with

$$\Phi_1^{(1,1)} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} e^{itE(k)+ik(x-y)} m_-^0(x,k)m_+^0(y,k)\varphi(k)(|T(k)|^2-1)\chi(k-k_0)dk$$

and $\phi_1^{(1,2)}$ defined similarly but with $(1-\chi(k-k_0))$. Then by stationary phase $\left|\phi_1^{(1,1)}(t,x,y)\right| \le Ct^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Set $q^2/2 = p(k) - p(k_0)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}&\Phi_1^{(1,2)}(t,x,y) = e^{itp(k_0)}\int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{itq^2}\rho(q)dq \text{ where}\\ &\rho(q) = m_-^0(x,k(q))m_+^0(y,k(q))\varphi(k(q))(1-\chi(k(q)-k_0))(|T(k(q))|^2-1)dk/dq.\end{aligned}$$

Then $|\phi_1^{(1,2)}(t,x,y)| \le Ct^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\rho(q)\|_{H^1}$. Inequality $\|\rho(q)\|_{H^1} < \infty$ follows by Lemma 5.4, by (6.7) and by $\|(1-\chi(k(q)-k_0))dk/dq\|_{H^1} < \infty$, Lemma 4.9 [C2]. We have

$$\begin{aligned}&\phi_2(t,x,y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^+} e^{itE(k)+ik(x-y)}|T(k)|^2 g_{x,y}(k)\varphi(k)dk \text{ with}\\ &g_{x,y}(k) = m_-(x,k)m_+(y,k) - m_-^0(x,k)m_+^0(y,k).\end{aligned}$$

Then also $|\phi_2(t,x,y)| \le Ct^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ by (6.4) and proceeding as above.

§7 WAVE OPERATORS AND PARTIAL DIAGONALIZATION FOR H_ω

We write $H_\omega = \sigma_3(h+\omega) + B^*(\omega)A$ with $A(x) = \langle x\rangle^{-\tau}$ with $\tau > 3/2$ and $B^*(x,\omega)$ a C^2 function in (x,ω) with values in the space of 2×2 real valued matrices. For any ω in some compact set K there is a constant $c(K) > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$ such that $\left|e^{\alpha|x|}B^*(x,\omega)\right| \le c_m(K)\ \forall x \in \mathbb{R}$. We have:

Proposition 7.1. *Assume that H_ω does not have resonances at $\pm\omega$ and $\sigma_e(H_\omega)$ does not contain eigenvalues. Then there are isomorphisms inverses of each other $W(\omega)\colon L^2_x \to L^2_c(H_\omega)$ and $Z(\omega)\colon L^2_c(H_\omega) \to L^2_x$, defined as follows: for $u \in L^2_x$, and v such that $\sigma_3 v \in L^2_c(H_\omega)$,*

$$\langle Wu, v\rangle = \langle u, v\rangle + \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0^+} \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \langle AR_{\sigma_3(h+\omega)}(\lambda+i\varepsilon)u, BR_{H^*_\omega}(\lambda+i\varepsilon)v\rangle d\lambda;$$

for $u \in L^2_c(H_\omega)$, $v \in L^2_x$,

$$\langle Zu, v\rangle = \langle u, v\rangle + \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0^+} \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \langle AR_{H_\omega}(\lambda+i\varepsilon)u, BR_{\sigma_3(h+\omega)}(\lambda+i\varepsilon)v\rangle d\lambda.$$

Then $P_c(H_\omega)H_\omega = W\sigma_3(h+\omega)Z$. $\|W(\omega)\|_{B(L^2_x, L^2_c(H_\omega))}$ and $\|Z(\omega)\|_{B(L^2_c(H_\omega), L^2_x)}$ are uniformly locally bounded in ω.

We need to show that there is a fixed $c > 0$ such that $\forall\, \epsilon \neq 0$

$$\int \|\langle x\rangle^{-\tau} R_{\sigma_3(h+\omega)}(\lambda+i\varepsilon)u\|^2_{L^2_x} d\lambda \le c\|u\|^2_{L^2_x} \text{ for all } u \in L^2_x \tag{1}$$

$$\int \|BR_{\sigma_3(h+\omega)}(\lambda+i\varepsilon)u\|^2_{L^2_x} d\lambda \le c\|u\|^2_2 \text{ for all } u \in L^2_x \tag{2}$$

$$\int \|BR_{H^*_\omega}(\lambda+i\varepsilon)u\|^2_{L^2_x} d\lambda \le c\|u\|^2_{L^2_x} \text{ for all } u \in L^2(H^*_\omega) := \sigma_3 L^2(H_\omega) \tag{3}$$

$$\int \|\langle x\rangle^{-\tau} R_{H_\omega}(\lambda+i\varepsilon)u\|^2_{L^2_x} d\lambda \le c\|u\|^2_{L^2_x} \text{ for all } u \in L^2_c(H_\omega). \tag{4}$$

Let us first prove (1), (2). They are consequences of (5) for $\tau > 3/2$:

$$\int \|\langle x\rangle^{-\tau} R_h(\lambda+i\varepsilon)u\|^2_{L^2_x} d\lambda \le c\|u\|^2_{L^2_x} \text{ for all } u \in L^2_x. \tag{5}$$

By (5.3) in Theorem 5.1 [K], (5) will follow from

$$\|\langle x\rangle^{-\tau} R_h(z)\langle x\rangle^{-\tau}\|_{B(L^2_x, L^2_x)} < C \text{ for all } z \text{ with } 0 < |\Im z|. \tag{6}$$

Observe that for $\Im k \ge 0$, $\pm(x-y) \ge 0$ and setting $w(k) = W[f_+(k), f_-(k)]$,

$$\langle x\rangle^{-\tau}R_h(E(k),x,y)\langle y\rangle^{-\tau}=e^{ik|x-y|}\langle x\rangle^{-\tau}m_{\pm}(x,k)m_{\mp}(y,k)\langle y\rangle^{-\tau}w^{-1}(k).$$

By Lemma 6.1, $|m_{\pm}(x,k)m_{\mp}(y,k)|\lesssim\langle x\rangle\langle y\rangle$. By Lemma 6.4, $|w(k)|\gtrsim\langle k\rangle$. Hence

$$\langle x\rangle^{-\tau}|R_h(z,x,y)|\langle y\rangle^{-\tau}\le C\langle z\rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}}\langle x\rangle^{1-\tau}\langle y\rangle^{1-\tau} \tag{7}$$

for all z with $\Im z\ge 0$ resp. $\Im z\le 0$ (for $\Im z=0$ there are two different continuations). Then for all z with $\Im z\ge 0$ resp. $\Im z\le 0$

$$\|\langle x\rangle^{-\tau}R_h(z,x,y)\langle y\rangle^{-\tau}\|_{L^2_{x,y}}\le C\langle z\rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{8}$$

(8) implies (6). We consider now (3) and (4), and for definiteness we focus on (4). We have for $A=\langle x\rangle^{-\tau}$

$$AR_{H_\omega}(z)u=(1+AR_{\sigma_3(h+\omega)}(z)B^*)^{-1}AR_{\sigma_3(h+\omega)}(z)u. \tag{9}$$

(8) implies $\|AR_{\sigma_3(h+\omega)}(z)B^*\|_{B(L^2,L^2)}\lesssim\langle z\rangle^{-1/2}$. By Fredholm theory there is a bounded 0 measure set $X\subset\mathbb{R}$ such that in $\mathbb{R}\backslash X$ the following limits exist

$$\lim_{\epsilon\searrow 0}R_{H_\omega}(\lambda+i\varepsilon)=R^{\pm}_{H_\omega}(\lambda)\text{ in }C^0_{loc}(\mathbb{R}\backslash X,B(L^{2,\tau}_x,L^{2,-\tau}_x)).$$

A point λ belongs to X exactly if $\ker(1+AR^{\alpha}_{\sigma_3(h+\omega)}(\lambda)B^*)\ne 0$ in L^2 for $\alpha=+$ or $-$. The points in $X\backslash\sigma_e(H_\omega)$ are eigenvalues of H_ω. This follows from (9). Furthermore, the hypothesis that $\sigma_e(H_\omega)$ contains no eigenvalues of H_ω implies that $X\backslash\sigma_e(H_\omega)$ is exactly the set of eigenvalues of H_ω. The exponential decay of $H_\omega-\sigma_3(h_0+\omega)$ implies, by standard arguments, that H_ω has finitely many eigenvalues. Therefore for z close to an eigenvalue of H_ω and for $u\in L^2_c(H_\omega)$ we have that $\|AR_{H_\omega}(z)u\|_{L^2_x}\le c\|R_{H_\omega}(z)u\|_{L^2_x}\le c'\|u\|_{L^2_x}$ for fixed constants. We will show below that $X\cap\sigma_e(H_\omega)$ is empty. Notice that this yields (4). To see this let $N\subset\mathbb{R}$ be the neighborhood of $\sigma_e(\mathcal{H}_\omega)$ formed by the points with distance $<\delta$ from $\sigma_e(\mathcal{H}_\omega)$, with $\delta>0$ a small number. We split the integral in (4) in two integrals with domain $\mathbb{R}\backslash N$ and N. The integral with domain $\mathbb{R}\backslash N$ is bounded, since for $\lambda\in\mathbb{R}\backslash N$ we have $\|\langle x\rangle^{-\tau}R_{H_\omega}(\lambda+i\varepsilon)u\|_2\le\|R_{H_\omega}(\lambda+i\varepsilon)u\|_2\le C\|u\|_2$ for a fixed C and $\mathbb{R}\backslash N$ is a bounded set. To bound the integral with domain N we use formula (9) above where $H_0=\sigma_3(h+\omega)$

$$\langle x\rangle^{-\tau}R_{H_\omega}(\lambda+i\varepsilon)u=(1+\langle x\rangle^{-\tau}R_{H_0}(\lambda+i\varepsilon)B^*)^{-1}\langle x\rangle^{-\tau}R_{H_0}(\lambda+i\varepsilon)u.$$

Then for any $u \in L^2$

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\langle x\rangle^{-\tau} R_{H_\omega}(\lambda + i\varepsilon)u\|_{L^2_\lambda(N,L^2_x)} \le \\ (10)\quad &\|(1+\langle x\rangle^{-\tau} R_{H_0}(\lambda + i\varepsilon)B^*)^{-1}\|_{L^\infty_\lambda(N,B(L^2_x,L^2_x))} \|\langle x\rangle^{-\tau} R_{H_0}(\lambda + i\varepsilon)u\|_{L^2_\lambda(N,L^2_x)}. \end{aligned}$$

The first factor in rhs(10) is uniformly bounded by the hypothesis that $X \cap \sigma_e(H_\omega)$ is empty, while the second factor in rhs(10) is bounded for any $u \in \ell^2$ by (1). This yields (4), with the proof of (3) similar.

Now we return to the set X. Our aim is tho show that X is formed exactly by the eigenvalues of H_ω. It is enough to show that $X \cap \sigma_e(\mathcal{H}_\omega)$ is empty. We will proceed in two steps. We will first show that by (H7) X does not contain any of these extremes thresholds of $\sigma_3(h+\omega)$, Lemma 7.2. We will then show that the points of X in the interior of the spectral bands are necessarily eigenvalues of H_ω. Since such "embedded" eigenvalues do not exist by (H7), then we can conclude that $X \cap \sigma_e(\mathcal{H}_\omega)$ is empty.

Lemma 7.2. *X does not contain extremes of the spectral bands of $\sigma_3(h+\omega)$.*

Proof. Suppose the claim is wrong, and that $\lambda \in X$ is an extremum of one of the spectral bands of $\sigma_3(h+\omega)$, and pick $w \neq 0$ in L^2 such that

$$(1 + AR_{\sigma_3(h+\omega)}(\lambda)B^*)w = 0.$$

Then $(1 + B^*AR_{\sigma_3(h+\omega)}(\lambda))B^*w = 0$. Then $\psi = R_{\sigma_3(h+\omega)}(\lambda)B^*w$ is $\psi \neq 0$ and by standard arguments is a nontrivial distributional solution of $(H_\omega - \lambda)u = 0$. We claim that

$$\psi \in L^\infty_x. \tag{10}$$

If (10) is true, we get contradiction with hypothesis (H7). The proof of (10) reduces at showing that for a rapidly decreasing bounded function $g(y)$ we have

$$\|f\|_{L^\infty_x} < \infty \text{ for } f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} R_h(x,y,\lambda)g(y)dy.$$

This is a consequence of Lemmas 6.1 and 6.4 and, for $w(k) = W[f_+(k), f_-(k)]$, of

$$f(x) = f_+(x,k)\int_{-\infty}^x f_-(y,k)g(y)dy/w(k) + f_-(x,k)\int_x^\infty f_-(y,k)g(y)dy/w(k).$$

This proves Lemma 7.2.

Lemma 7.3. *For any λ_0 in the interior of $\sigma_e(H_\omega)$ there are an open interval $I\subset\sigma_e(H_\omega)$ with $\lambda_0\in I$ and a constant C such that $\|AR(\lambda\pm i\varepsilon)u\|_{L^2_\lambda(I)L^2_x}\le C\|u\|_{L^2_x}$ for any u.*

Proof. Let $AB_1^*=AB^*-\sigma_3 q$. Then $H_\omega=\sigma_3(h_0+\omega)+AB_1^*$. The points $\lambda_0\in\sigma(\sigma_3(h_0+\omega))$ where $\|AR(\lambda\pm i\varepsilon)u\|_{L^2_\lambda(I)L^2_x}$ is unbounded for I a small neighborhood of λ_0 are such that if we set

$$AR^{\pm}_{H_\omega}(\lambda)u=(1+AR^{\pm}_{\sigma_3(h_0+\omega)}(\lambda)B_1^*)^{-1}AR_{\sigma_3(h_0+\omega)}(\lambda)u, \tag{11}$$

we have for one of the two signs

$$\ker(1+AR^{\pm}_{\sigma_3(h_0+\omega)}(\lambda_0)B_1^*)\neq 0.$$

By a standard argument, see §2 [CPV], if we assume Lemma 7.4 below we conclude that such point λ_0 is an eigenvalue of H_ω. Since we are excluding eigenvalues inside the spectral bands of $\sigma_e(H_\omega)$ we are done with the proof Lemma 7.3.

Lemmas 7.2 and 7.3 imply that X coincides with $\sigma_d(H_\omega)\cap\mathbb{R}$. The above arguments moreover imply that the following limits exist

$$\lim_{\epsilon\searrow 0}R_{H_\omega}(\lambda\pm i\varepsilon)=R^{\pm}_{H_\omega}(\lambda)\text{ in }C^0(\sigma_e(H_\omega),B(L^{2,\tau}_x,L^{2,-\tau}_x)). \tag{12}$$

Lemma 7.4. *Fix E_0 in the interior of a spectral band of h_0. Suppose that there is a function $\psi(x)$ such that $\psi\in L^{2,s}_x$ for all $s>0$ and $\mathcal{F}_{h_0}(\psi)(\pm k_0)=0$, where $E_0=E(k_0)$. Then $R^{\pm}_{h_0}(E_0)\psi\in L^2_x$.*

Proof. Consider a cutoff $\chi(E)\in C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R})$ with $\chi(E)=1$ for E close to E_0 and $\chi(E)=0$ if $|E-E_0|\ge\varepsilon_0>0$ for ε_0 a small fixed number. Then

$$R^{\pm}_{h_0}(E_0)\psi=R^{\pm}_{h_0}(E_0)\chi(h_0)\psi+R^{\pm}_{h_0}(E_0)(1-\chi(h_0))\psi.$$

The second term in the right is in L^2_x. With the notation in §5 we have

$$\mathcal{F}_{h_0}(\chi(h_0)\psi)(k)=\int_{\mathbb{R}}e^{ikx}m^0_+(x,k)\chi(E(k))\psi(x)dx.$$

Notice that $m^0_+(x,k)\chi(E(k))$ is the symbol of a smoothing pseudodifferential operator. This implies that $\partial^n_k\mathcal{F}_{h_0}(\chi(h_0)\psi)\in L^2_k$ for all n by Lemma 5.4. Since $k_0\notin\mathcal{T}$, $\dot{E}(k_0)\neq 0$ by Lemma 5.2. Then also

$$\partial^n_k\left[\frac{\mathcal{F}_{h_0}(\psi)(k)\chi(E(k))}{E(k)-E_0}\right]\in C^0\cap L^1_k\text{ for all }n.$$

We have

$$R^{\pm}_{h_0}(E_0)\chi(h_0)\psi(x)=\int_{\mathbb{R}}e^{-ikx}m^0_-(x,k)\frac{\mathcal{F}_{h_0}(\psi)(k)}{E(k)-E_0}\chi(E(k))dk.$$

Integrating by parts we conclude $x^N R^{\pm}_{h_0}(E_0)\chi(h_0)\psi(x)\in L^\infty_x$ for all N.

By Proposition 7.1 and by the spectral Theorem we conclude:

Lemma 7.5. *For any $u \in L^2_x$ we have*

$$P_c(H_\omega)u = \lim_{M\to\infty} \lim_{\epsilon\to 0^+} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\sigma_e(H_\omega)} \chi_{[-M,M]}(\lambda) \left[R_{H_\omega}(\lambda + i\epsilon) - R_{H_\omega}(\lambda - i\epsilon)\right] u d\lambda.$$

Finally, we obtain the limiting absorption principle:

Lemma 7.6. *For any $u \in L^{2,\tau}_x$ with $\tau > 3/2$ we have*

$$P_c(H_\omega)u = \lim_{M\to\infty} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\sigma_e(H_\omega)} \chi_{[-M,M]}(\lambda) \left[R^+_{H_\omega}(\lambda) - R^-_{H_\omega}(\lambda)\right] u d\lambda.$$

Proof. For $u \in L^{2,\tau}_x$ and for fixed M the $\epsilon \to 0^+$ limit in Lemma 7.5 converges in $L^{2,-\tau}_x$ to the integral in Lemma 7.6.

§8 PLANE WAVES FOR H_ω

We recall $H_\omega = \sigma_3(h_0 + \omega) + V(x)$ with:

- $V(x)$ a real entries square 2 matrix s.t. $\sigma_1 V(x) = -V(x)\sigma_1$ and $\sigma_3 V(x) = {}^tV(x)\sigma_3$;
- $|V(x)| \le Ce^{-\sqrt{2\omega}|x|}$;
- H_ω has no eigenvalues in $\sigma_e(H_\omega)$ and the points and the thresholds of the spectral bands of $\sigma_e(H_\omega)$ are not resonances. This last statement means that for any $k \in \mathcal{T}$, and for $\lambda = E(k \pm 0) + \omega)$, as well as for $\lambda = -E(k \pm 0) - \omega$, if $g \in L^\infty_x$ satisfies $H_\omega g = \lambda g$, then $g = 0$.

We set

$$\eta(x) = \int_x^\infty |V(t)|dt, \quad \gamma(x) = \int_x^\infty \langle t\rangle |V(t)|dt.$$

We have $\sigma_e(H_\omega) = (\omega + \sigma(h_0)) \cup (-\omega - \sigma(h_0))$. Because of the symmetries of H_ω we look at Jost functions $F_\pm(x,k)$ close to $\omega + \sigma(h_0)$.

For $\lambda \notin \sigma_e(H_\omega)$ let $k \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\Im k \ge 0$ such that $\lambda = E(k) + \omega$ (in the sequel, for λ and k in the same sentence, we will have always the relation $\lambda = E(k) + \omega$). We consider now solutions of $H_\omega u = \lambda u$ of the following form, where $A(x,t,k)$ is given by (6.4):

$$\begin{aligned} F_\pm(x,k) =& \phi^0_\pm(x,k)\overrightarrow{e}_1 - \int_x^{\pm\infty} A(x,t,k)\text{diag }(1,0)V(t)F_\pm(t,k)dt - \\ & - \int_{\mathbb{R}} R_{h_0}(-2\omega - E(k), x, t)\text{diag }(0,1)V(t)F_\pm(t,k)dt. \end{aligned} \tag{8.1}$$

Lemma 8.1. *Assume (H7) and (H9). Then there is a small* $\delta > 0$ *and a finite set* $S \subset \overline{\mathbb{C}}_+$ *such that for* $k \notin S$ *with* $0 \le \Im k \le \delta$, *(8.1) has for any choice of sign a unique solution satisfying the estimates listed below for* $M_\pm(x,k) := e^{\mp ikx}F_\pm(x,k)$. *These solutions solve* $H_\omega u = \lambda u$ *with* $\lambda = \omega + E(k)$ *and with the asymptotic property* $F_\pm(x,k) = \phi^0_\pm(x,k)\overrightarrow{e}_1 + o(e^{\pm ikx})$ *for* $x \to \pm\infty$. *For any fixed* $0 < a < \sqrt{2\omega}$ *and any* $\varepsilon > 0$ *there is* C_ε *such that* $\forall\, x \in \mathbb{R}$ *and* $\forall\, k \in \mathbb{C}$ *with* $0 \le \Im k \le \delta$ *and* $dist(k,S) > \varepsilon > 0$ *we have:*

$$(1) \qquad |M_\pm(x,k) - m^0_\pm(x,k)\overrightarrow{e}_1| \le C_\varepsilon e^{-a\max(1,\mp x)}\langle k\rangle^{-1}(1+\max(1,\mp x));$$

$$(2) \qquad \left|\partial_k[M_\pm(x,k) - m^0_\pm(x,k)\overrightarrow{e}_1]\right| \le C_\varepsilon \max{}^2(1,\mp x);$$

$$(3) \qquad \left|\partial^2_k[M_\pm(x,k) - m^0_\pm(x,k)\overrightarrow{e}_1]\right| \le C_\varepsilon \max{}^3(1,\mp x).$$

Proof. We sketch the proof for the + case and drop the index. Using the notation in §6,

$$\begin{aligned} M(x,k) =& m^0_+(x,k)\overrightarrow{e}_1 - \int_x^\infty D_k(x,t)\text{diag } (1,0)V(t)M(t,k)dt - \\ &- \int_{\mathbb{R}} R_{h_0}(-2\omega - E(k),x,t)e^{-ik(x-t)}\text{diag } (0,1)V(t)M(t,k)dt. \end{aligned} \tag{8.2}$$

We have $\left|R_{h_0}(-2\omega - E(k),x,t)e^{-ik(x-t)}\right| \le Ce^{-\sqrt{2\omega}|x-t|}\langle k\rangle^{-1}$. Let for $V = \{V_{\ell,j}\}$

$$\begin{aligned} &{}^tM = (M_1, M_2)\,, \quad M_1^{(1)}(x,k) := -\int_x^\infty D_k(x,t)V_{12}(t)M_2(t,k)dt\,, \\ &M_1^{(0)}(x,k) := m^0_+(x,k) - \int_x^\infty D_k(x,t)V_{11}(t)M_1(t,k)dt. \end{aligned}$$

Then $M_1(x,k) = M_1^{(0)}(x,k) + M_1^{(1)}(x,k)$. By standard arguments:

Lemma 8.2. *For given* $M_2 \in L^\infty_x$ *for some fixed* $C = C(V)$ *we have:*

$$(1) \qquad |M_1^{(0)}(x,k) - m^0_+(x,k)| \le C\max(1,-x)\gamma(x)\langle k\rangle^{-1};$$

$$(2) \qquad |M_1^{(1)}(x,k)| \le C\max(1,-x)\gamma(x)\langle k\rangle^{-1}\|M_2(\cdot,k)\|_{L^\infty_x}.$$

Continuation of proof of Lemma 8.1. We have $M_1^{(1)}(x,k) = L(k)M_2(x,k)$ with $L(k)$ a linear operator such that for a fixed C

$$(3) \qquad |L(k)M_2(x)| \le C\langle k\rangle^{-1}\max(1,-x)\|M_2(\cdot,k)\|_{L^\infty_x}.$$

Eliminate M_1 from (8.2) to get the following system for $K(k)$ defined below

(8.3)
$$(1+K(k))M_2(x,k) = -\int_{\mathbb{R}} R_{h_0}(-2\omega - E(k), x, t) e^{-ik(x-t)} V_{21}(t) M_1^{(0)}(t,k)dt$$

$$K(k)g(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} R_{h_0}(-2\omega - E(k), x, t) e^{-ik(x-t)} \left(V_{21}(t)L(k)[g](t) + V_{22}(t)g(t)\right) dt.$$

Lemma 8.3. *Let $0 \le \Im k < \delta < \sqrt{2\omega} - a$ for some $a > 0$. Then $K(k)$ maps L^∞_x in $e^{-a|x|}W^{1,\infty}_x$. There is a finite set $S \subset \overline{\mathbb{C}}_+$ such that for k as above with $k \notin S$ equation (8.3) admits a unique solution $M_2(x,k) \in L^\infty_x$. Furthermore, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a C_ε such that if dist$(k,S) > \varepsilon$ then*

$$\left| e^{a|x|} M_2(x,k) \right| \le C_\varepsilon \langle k \rangle^{-1}. \tag{1}$$

Proof. The fact that $K(k) : L^\infty_x \to e^{-a|x|}W^{1,\infty}_x$ if $0 \le \Im k < \delta < \sqrt{2\omega} - a$ is an elementary computation. For $|k| \to \infty$ we have $\|K(k)\|_{B(L^\infty_x, L^\infty_x)} \to 0$ so we can solve (8.3) obtaining (1). $K(k) : L^\infty_x \to L^\infty_x$ is a compact operator. For $|k| \lesssim 1$ by the Fredholm alternative S will be formed by the k with $\ker(1 + K(k)) \neq 0$. The set S is necessarily discrete and contained in $|k| \lesssim 1$. We start by considering an $k \in S \cap \mathbb{R}$. If we have such a k then, we have a nonzero solution of the equation obtained from (8.3) replacing $M_1^{(0)}(t,k)$ with 0. Going backwards in the above argument, we obtain the existence of a nontrivial $g \in L^\infty_x$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} g(x) = &-\int_x^\infty A(x,t,k)\text{diag }(1,0)V(t)g(t)dt - \\ &-\int_{\mathbb{R}} R_{h_0}(-2\omega - E(k), x, t)\text{diag }(0,1)V(t)g(t)dt. \end{aligned} \tag{8.4}$$

Such $g \in L^\infty_x$ is a distributional solution of $H_\omega g = \lambda g$ with $\lambda = E(k) + \omega$. By hypothesis we are assuming such solutions do not exist for $\lambda = E(k \pm 0) + \omega$ with $k \in \mathcal{T}$, that is for λ a threshold in $\sigma_e(H_\omega)$. By continuity, $\ker(1 + K(k)) = 0$ near such thresholds. Since the points in $\mathcal{T}$ are the only possible accumulation points of S, we conclude that S is finite.

Continuation of proof of Lemma 8.1. Lemmas 8.2-3 imply (1) in Lemma 8.1. To prove (2) we differentiate (8.2) in k obtaining for the dot representing ∂_k, and for $E_k(x,t) = R_{h_0}(-2\omega - E(k), x, t)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\dot{M}(x,k) = \overrightarrow{e}_1 \dot{m}^0_+(x,k) - \\
(4)\qquad &-\left(\int_x^\infty D_k(x,t)\text{diag }(1,0) + \int_{\mathbb{R}} E_k(x,t)\text{diag }(0,1)\right) V(t)\dot{M}(t,k)dt \\
&-\left(\int_x^\infty \dot{D}_k(x,t)\text{diag }(1,0) + \int_{\mathbb{R}} \dot{E}_k(x,t)\text{diag }(0,1)\right) V(t)M(t,k)dt.
\end{aligned}
$$

We have $|\partial_k^j E_k(x,t)| \le Ce^{-\alpha\langle k\rangle|x-t|}$ for $j=0,1$ for fixed $C>0$ and $\alpha>0$. We write $\dot{M}_1(x,k) = \dot{M}_1^{(0)}(x,k) + \dot{M}_1^{(1)}(x,k)$, with $\dot{M}_1^{(1)}(x,k) = L(k)\dot{M}_2(x,k)$, with

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\dot{M}_1^{(0)}(x,k)\overrightarrow{e}_1 = \overrightarrow{e}_1 \dot{m}^0_+(x,k) + \\
&+ (\text{ third line of (4)}) - \overrightarrow{e}_1 \int_x^\infty D_k(x,t)V_{12}(t)\dot{M}_2(t,k)dt.
\end{aligned}
$$

Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|\dot{M}_1^{(0)}(x,k)| \le C\text{max}^2(1,-x) \text{ and} \\
&|L(k)\dot{M}_2(x,k)| \le C\langle k\rangle^{-1}\text{max}(1,-x)\|\dot{M}_2(\cdot,k)\|_{L^\infty_x}.
\end{aligned}
$$

We obtain an analogue of system (8.3), with $M_1^{(0)}(x,k)$ replaced by $\dot{M}_1^{(0)}(x,k)$. Then we conclude $|e^{a|x|}\dot{M}_2(x,k)| \le \frac{C}{1+|k|}$. Repeating the argument in a similar way, we get claim (3) in Lemma 8.1.

If $S\cap\mathbb{R}=\emptyset$, by taking δ small enough we can neglect the set S. However in Lemma 5.4 [C1] the proof that $S\cap\mathbb{R}=\emptyset$ is wrong. In fact the discussion in [KS] allows for the existence of S. So let us assume now $S\cap\mathbb{R}\neq\emptyset$. For k near $S\cap\mathbb{R}$ we consider the system

$$
(8.5)\qquad (1+R^+_{\sigma_3(h_0+\omega)}(\lambda)V)\Phi_\pm(\cdot,k) = \phi^0_\pm(x,k)\overrightarrow{e}_1.
$$

Lemma 8.4. *Let $\lambda = E(k)+\omega$ with $E(k)\in\sigma(h_0)$ with $k\neq\pm\pi n(j)$ for all j.*

(1) For any choice of signs, system (8.5) admits exactly one solution in L^∞_x.
(2) For $k\notin S$ we have $\Phi_\pm(x,k) = c_\pm(k)F_\pm(x,k)$ for some constants $c_\pm(k)$.
(3) Fix a decomposition $V=B^*A$ with A and $B^*\in C^2$ and exponentially decreasing. Then $k\to A\Phi_\pm(x,k)\in L^2_x$ is a real analytic map for k near S.
(4) $c_\pm(k)$ are real analytic functions in k for k near S.

Proof. For definiteness pick $+$. For $\lambda=E+\omega$ we claim that $R^+_{\sigma_3(h_0+\omega)}(\lambda)V$

$$
(5)\qquad \text{is a } L^\infty_x\to L^\infty_x \text{ compact operator.}
$$

We have

$$R^+_{\sigma_3(h+\omega)}(\lambda)V = \sigma_3 \begin{bmatrix} R^+_{h_0}(E)V_{11} & R^+_{h_0}(E)V_{12} \\ R^+_{h_0}(-E-2\omega)V_{21} & R^+_{h_0}(-E-2\omega)V_{22} \end{bmatrix}.$$

So the proof of (5) reduces at proving that the operators $R^+_{h_0}(-E-2\omega)\nu(x)$ and $R^+_{h_0}(E)\nu(x)$ are compact from L^∞_x into itself for $\nu(x)$ an exponentially decreasing C^2 scalar function. These operators are defined in L^∞_x with values in $W^{1,\infty}_x$. Since $R^+_{h_0}(-E-2\omega)\nu(x)$ maps L^∞_x in $e^{-a|x|}L^\infty_x$ for a fixed $a = a(\omega_0) > 0$, it is easy to conclude that $R^+_{h_0}(-E-2\omega)\nu(x)$ satisfies (5). We have for $w_0(k) = [\phi^0_+(k), \phi^0_-(k)]$, $R^+_{h_0}(E)[\nu g](x) =$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \phi^0_+(x,k)C_-(g) - \int_x^\infty \left[\phi^0_+(x,k)\phi^0_-(y,k) - \phi^0_+(y,k)\phi^0_-(x,k)\right]\nu(y)g(y)dy/w_0(k) \\ &= \phi^0_-(x,k)C_+(g) + \int_{-\infty}^x \left[\phi^0_+(x,k)\phi^0_-(y,k) - \phi^0_+(y,k)\phi^0_-(x,k)\right]\nu(y)g(y)dy/w_0(k) \end{aligned}$$

with $C_\pm(g) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi^0_\pm(y,k)\nu(y)g(y)dy/w_0(k)$. Given a sequence $\{g_n\}$ with $\|g_n\|_\infty \le 1$ we want to show that a subsequence of $\{R^+_{h_0}(E)[\nu g_n]\}$ converges in L^∞_x. It is not restrictive to assume that $\{R^+_{h_0}(E)[\nu g_n]\}$ converges in $L^\infty_{loc}(\mathbb{R})$, and $\{C_+(g_n)\}$ and $\{C_-(g_n)\}$ converge in $\mathbb{C}$. It is elementary conclude by the above formulas on $R^+_{h_0}(E)[\nu g](x)$, that $\{R^+_{h_0}(E)[\nu g_n]\}$ converges in L^∞_x.

Having established that (5) is compact, by Fredholm theory we know that (8.5) has a unique solution unless there is a nonzero solution $g \in L^\infty_x$ of

$$(1 + R^+_{\sigma_3(h_0+\omega)}(\lambda)V)g = 0. \tag{6}$$

Notice that ${}^t g = (g_1, g_2)$

$$H_\omega g = \lambda g \text{ in the sense of distributions} \tag{7}$$

and that $|g_2(x)| \le Ce^{-\sqrt{2\omega}|x|}$ for some $C > 0$. By (6) we obtain

$$\langle (1 + R^+_{\sigma_3(h_0+\omega)}(\lambda)V)g, \sigma_3 V g\rangle = 0.$$

Then

$$\langle \delta(h_0 - E(k))(V_{11}g_1 + V_{12}g_2), V_{11}g_1 + V_{12}g_2\rangle = 0. \tag{8}$$

Notice that $V_{11}g_1 + V_{12}g_2 \in L^{2,s}_x$ for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$. For $\psi \in L^{2,s}_x$ with $s > 1/2$ we have

$$\langle \delta(h_0 - E(k))\psi, \psi\rangle = |\dot{E}(k))|^{-1}\left(|\mathcal{F}_{h_0}\psi(k)|^2 + |\mathcal{F}_{h_0}\psi(-k)|^2\right).$$

So if we set $\psi = V_{11}g_1 + V_{12}g_2$, then $\mathcal{F}_{h_0}\psi(\pm k) = 0$. We can apply Lemma 7.4 and conclude that

$$g_1 = R^{+}_{h_0}(E(k))\psi \in L^2(\mathbb{R}).$$

So $g \in L^2_x$ and (7) imply that g is an eigenfunction and that λ is an eigenvalue. Since we are excluding this possibility, we conclude that there are non nonzero solutions of (6) and that Claim (1) is correct.

From (8.5) we get for $w_0(k) = W[\phi^0_+(k), \phi^0_-(k)]$

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_\pm(x,k) &= \phi^0_\pm(x,k)\overrightarrow{e}_1 \\ &+ \phi^0_+(x,k)\int_{-\infty}^{x}\phi^0_-(y,k)\mathrm{diag}(1,0)V(y)\Phi_\pm(y,k)dy/w_0(k) \\ &- \phi^0_-(x,k)\int_{x}^{\infty}\phi^0_+(y,k)\mathrm{diag}(1,0)V(y)\Phi_\pm(y,k)dy/w_0(k) \\ &- \int_{\mathbb{R}} R_{h_0}(\omega - E(k),x,y)\mathrm{diag}\ (0,1)V(y)\Phi_\pm(y,k)dy.\end{aligned} \tag{8.6}$$

Then, for

$$\begin{aligned}c_+(k) &= 1 + \int_{\mathbb{R}}\phi^0_-(y,k)(V_{11}(y)\Phi_{1+}(y,k) + V_{12}(y)\Phi_{2+}(y,k))dy/w_0(k) \\ c_-(k) &= 1 - \int_{\mathbb{R}}\phi^0_+(y,k)(V_{11}(y)\Phi_{1-}(y,k) + V_{12}(y)\Phi_{2-}(y,k))dy/w_0(k)\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

and for $k \notin S$ we have for $g_\pm(x) := \Phi_\pm(x,k) - c_\pm(k)F_\pm(x,k)$,

$$g \in L^\infty_x \text{ with } \lim_{x\to\pm\infty} g_\pm(x) = 0 \text{ and } H_\omega g_\pm = \lambda g_\pm.$$

Since $k \notin S$ this yields $g_\pm \equiv 0$.

To prove claims (3) and (4) we write (8.5) as

$$(1 + AR^{+}_{\sigma_3(h_0+\omega)}(\lambda)B^*)A\Phi_\pm(\cdot,k) = A\phi^0_\pm(x,k)\overrightarrow{e}_1.$$

Since $AR^{+}_{\sigma_3(h_0+\omega)}(\lambda)B^* \in B(L^2_x, L^2_x)$ is real analytic in k, and similarly $k \to A\phi^0_\pm(x,k) \in L^2_x$ is real analytic in k, we obtain claims (3) and (4) by the chain rule.

Lemma 8.1 yields Jost functions $F(x,k)$ for H_ω for energy λ close to $\omega + \sigma(h)$ and for $k \notin S$. By $\sigma_1 H_\omega = -H_\omega\sigma_1$ we conclude that $\sigma_1 F(x,k)$ are Jost functions for H_ω for energy λ close to $-\omega - \sigma(h)$. From $\sigma_3 H_\omega = H^*_\omega\sigma_3$ we get that $\sigma_3 F(x,k)$ are Jost functions for H^*_ω for energy λ close to $\omega + \sigma(h)$ and $\sigma_3\sigma_1 F(x,k)$ are Jost functions for H^*_ω for energy λ close to $-\omega - \sigma(h)$.

Lemma 8.5. *For $k \in \mathbb{R}\backslash S$ we have $\overline{F_\pm(x,k)} = F_\pm(x,-k)$ and for $k \neq 0$ we have*

$$F_\mp(x,k) = \frac{1}{T(k)}\overline{F_\pm(x,k)} + \frac{R_\pm(k)}{T(k)}F_\pm(x,k) \tag{1}$$

where $T(k)$ and $R_\pm(k)$ are defined by the above formula.

Proof. $\overline{F_\pm(x,k)} = F_\pm(x,-k)$ follows by the fact that $V(x)$ has real entries and by uniqueness in Lemma 8.1. We claim that the triples of functions in formula (1) in the statement are linearly dependent. Notice that this implies immediately the statement, since one can see near $+\infty$ by Lemma 8.1 that the functions on the right hand side of (1) are linearly independent. For definiteness we will prove linear dependence of $F_+(x,k)$, $F_-(x,k)$ and $\overline{F_-(x,k)}$. If we assume they are linearly independent, we can find a nonzero linear combination $g = \alpha F_+ + \beta F_- + \gamma\overline{F_-}$ with $g(x) \in L^\infty_x$ and $g(x) \to 0$ for $x \to +\infty$. Then $g(x)$ satisfies (8.4) and by the fact that $k \notin S$ we conclude $g(x) = 0$. So our assumption is absurd and the three functions are linearly dependent.

Lemma 8.6. *All the Wronskians below are constant. We have for any $k \in \mathbb{R}\backslash S$:*

$$W[\overline{F_\pm(k)}, F_\pm(k)] = W[\phi^0_\mp(\cdot,k), \phi^0_\pm(\cdot,k)], \tag{1}$$

$$T(k) = \frac{W[\phi^0_\mp(\cdot,k), \phi^0_\pm(\cdot,k)]}{W[F_\mp(k), F_\pm(k)]}, \quad R_\pm(k) = \frac{W[F_\mp(k), \overline{F_\pm}(k)]}{W[F_\pm(k), F_\mp(k)]} \tag{2}$$

$$\overline{T(k)} = T(-k)\,,\ \overline{R_\pm(k)} = R_\pm(-k), \tag{3}$$

$$|T(k)|^2 + |R_\pm(k)|^2 = 1\,, \quad T(k)\overline{R_\pm(k)} + R_\mp(k)\overline{T(k)} = 0. \tag{4}$$

Proof. For the fact that the Wronskians are constant see Lemma 5.8 [KS]. The rest of the proof is the same of Lemma 5.6 [C1].

Lemma 8.7. *For $k \in \mathbb{R}$ we have*

$$W[\Phi_+(k), \Phi_-(k)] = c_+(k)W[\phi^0_+(\cdot,k), \phi^0_-(\cdot,k)] = c_-(k)W[\phi^0_+(\cdot,k), \phi^0_-(\cdot,k)]. \tag{1}$$

In particular $c_+(k) = c_-(k) = T(k)$.

Proof. We have the asymptotic behaviors, with $\partial_x o(1) = o(1)$,

$$\Phi_+(x,k) = c_+(k)\phi^0_+(x,k)\overrightarrow{e}_1 + o(1) \text{ for } x \to +\infty$$
$$\Phi_-(x,k) = \phi^0_-(x,k)\overrightarrow{e}_1 + C_1(k)\phi^0_+(x,k)\overrightarrow{e}_1 + o(1) \text{ for } x \to +\infty$$
$$\Phi_-(x,k) = c_-(k)\phi^0_-(x,k)\overrightarrow{e}_1 + o(1) \text{ for } x \to -\infty$$
$$\Phi_+(x,k) = \phi^0_+(x,k)\overrightarrow{e}_1 + C_2(k)\phi^0_-(x,k)\overrightarrow{e}_1 + o(1) \text{ for } x \to -\infty$$

with $c_{\pm}(k)$ defined in Lemma 8.4 and for some constants $C_j(k)$ with $j = 1, 2$. In particular, for later use, $C_1(k)$ is smooth for k near S and given by

$$C_1(k) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi^0_-(y,k)(V_{11}(y)\Phi_{1-}(y,k) + V_{12}(y)\Phi_{2-}(y,k))dy/w_0(k). \tag{2}$$

(1) follows by using these asymptotic expansions and the fact that the Wronskian $W[\Phi_+(k), \Phi_-(k)]$ is a constant. We have

$$T(k) = \frac{W[\phi^0_-, \phi^0_+]}{W[F_-, F_+]} = c_+c_-\frac{W[\phi^0_-, \phi^0_+]}{W[\Phi_-, \Phi_+]} = \frac{c_+c_-}{c_\pm} = c_\pm.$$

Lemma 8.8. *$T(k)$ and $R_\pm(k)$ are in $C^1(\mathbb{R})$ and there is $C > 0$ such that for $n \leq 1$*

$$\left|d^n\left[T(k) - 1\right]/dk^n\right| + \left|d^n R_\pm(k)/dk^n\right| \leq C/\langle k\rangle.$$

Proof. Notice that for $k \notin T$ we have $W[\phi^0_-(k), \phi^0_+(k)] \neq 0$. So (4) Lemma 8.6 and the non resonance hypothesis at the thresholds imply $W[F_-, F_+] \neq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}\backslash S$. There $T(k)$ and $R_\pm(k)$ are C^1 with the desired asymptotic estimates by Lemma 8.1. Near S we use $T(k) = c_\pm(k)$ and (3) Lemma 8.4 to conclude that $T \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$. Near S

$$R_+(k) = \frac{W[F_-, \overline{F}_+]}{W[F_+, F_-]} = \frac{|c_+|^2}{c_+^2}\frac{W[\Phi_-, \overline{\Phi}_+]}{W[\Phi_+, \Phi_-]} = C_1(k)\frac{\overline{c}_+^2}{c_+^2}.$$

Here $C_1(k)$ is in (2) Lemma 8.7 and is smooth. If $k_0 \in S$ then there is some $m \geq$ such that $c_+^{(m)}(k_0) \neq 0$, then also $\overline{c}_+/c_+$ is smooth near k_0. So $R_+ \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$. The argument for R_- is similar.

We consider the following system :

$$\begin{aligned} G_\pm(x,k) = &\phi^0_\pm(x,k_1)\overrightarrow{e}_2 - \int_x^{\pm\infty} A(x,t,k)\text{diag }(1,0)V(t)G_\pm(t,k)dt - \\ &- \int_x^{\pm\infty} A(x,t,k_1)\text{diag }(0,1)V(t)g_\pm(t,k)dt \end{aligned} \tag{8.7}$$

where $E(k_1) = -E(k) - 2\omega$.

Lemma 8.9. *For $\lambda = \omega + E(k)$ with $0 \leq \Im k < \delta$ system (8.7) admits exactly one solution $G_\pm(x,k)$ which satisfies $H_\omega G_\pm = \lambda G_\pm$, $G_\pm(x,k)$ is real for $k \in \mathbb{R}$. There is C such that*

$$|G_\pm(x,k) - \phi^0_\pm(x,k_1)\overrightarrow{e}_2| \leq C\langle k\rangle^{-1}\left|\int_x^{\pm\infty}\langle t\rangle|V(t)|dt\right| e^{\mp x\Re\sqrt{k^2+2\omega}};$$

$$\left|\partial_x G_\pm - \partial_x\phi^0_\pm(x,k_1)\overrightarrow{e}_2\right| \leq C\left|\int_x^{\pm\infty}\langle t\rangle|V(t)|dt\right| e^{\mp x\Re\sqrt{k^2+2\omega}}.$$

We have $w(k) = [G_-(k), G_+(k)]$ *is a continuous function with* $w(k) = 0$ *if and only if* $k \in S$*. We have* $w(k) = 2\sqrt{k^2 + 2\omega}(1 + o(1))$ *for* $|k| \to \infty$*.*
We have $[F_\pm(x,k), G_\pm(x,k)] = 0$ *for any* $k \notin S$*. For* $\Im k > 0$ *and* $g \in L^\infty(b, +\infty)$*, for some* $b \in \mathbb{R}$*, with* $H_\omega g = \lambda g$*, then* $g(x) = \mu F_+(x,k) + \nu G_+(x,k)$ *for constants* μ *and* ν*. If* $g \in L^\infty(-\infty, b)$ *solves* $H_\omega g = \lambda g$*, then* $g(x) = \mu F_-(x,k) + \nu G_-(x,k)$

Proof. The fact that there is a unique $G_\pm(x,k)$ satisfying (8.6) and the estimates follow from the argument in Lemma 1 [DT]. The asymptotic expansion of $w(k) = [G_-(k), G_+(k)]$ for $|k| \to \infty$ follows from the inequalities. $k \in S$ exactly when $G_\pm(x,k) \in L^\infty_x$. This is the case exactly for $[G_-(k), G_+(k)] = 0$. Identity $[F_\pm, G_\pm] = 0$ follows by using the fact that the Wronskian is constant and by the asymptotic properties of the functions. Consider $h \in L^\infty(b, +\infty)$ with $H_\omega h = Eh$ with $\Im k > 0$ and $k \notin S$. By standard arguments there is a $b \le b_1$ such that in $[b_1, +\infty)$ there are two other solutions $a(x,k)$ and $b(x,k)$ of $H_\omega u = Eu$, both unbounded and such that $a(x,k)$, $b(x,k)$, $F_+(x,k)$ and $G_+(x,k)$ form a fundamental set of solutions. Then in $[b_1, +\infty)$ we have $h(x) = \mu F_+(x,k) + \nu G_+(x,k)$ and by unique continuation this holds in $(b, +\infty)$.

Lemma 8.10. *Let* $\lambda = \omega + E(k)$ *with* $0 < \Im k < \delta$ *and* $k \notin S$*. The resolvent* $R_{H_\omega}(\lambda)$ *has integral kernel given by* $R_{H_\omega}(x,y,\lambda) = R_1(x,y) + R_2(x,y)$ *with for* $x < y$

$$R_1(x,y) = -\frac{F_-(x,k)^t(\sigma_3 F_+(y,k))}{W[F_+(\cdot,k), F_-(\cdot,k)]} \text{ and } R_2(x,y) = -\frac{G_-(x,k)^t(\sigma_3 G_+(y,k))}{W[G_+(\cdot,k), G_-(\cdot,k)]}$$

and for $x > y$

$$R_1(x,y) = -\frac{F_+(x,k)^t(\sigma_3 F_-(y,k))}{W[F_+(\cdot,k), F_-(\cdot,k)]} \text{ and } R_2(x,y) = -\frac{G_+(x,k)^t(\sigma_3 G_-(y,k))}{W[G_+(\cdot,k), G_-(\cdot,k)]}.$$

We have $R_{H_\omega}(x,y,\overline{\lambda}) = \overline{R_{H_\omega}(x,y,\lambda)}$ *and* $R_{H_\omega}(x,y,-\lambda) = -\sigma_1 R_{H_\omega}(x,y,\lambda)\sigma_1$*.*

Proof. The last two equalities follow from the fact that H_ω is real and $\sigma_1 H_\omega = -H_\omega \sigma_1$. Let $R(x,y) = R_1(x,y) + R_2(x,y)$. To show that $R(x,y)$ is the kernel of the resolvent it is enough to show that for any fixed x and for any fixed λ the following equalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} A(x,\lambda) &:= \partial_x R(x,x^-) - \partial_x R(x,x^+) = -\sigma_3 \\ B(x,\lambda) &:= R(x,x^-) - R(x,x^+) = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Now, for $h(x) = F_+, F_-, G_+, G_-$, using the information on the Wronskians, we get

$$ {}^t h(x) A(x,\lambda) - {}^t h'(x) B(x,\lambda) = -{}^t h(x)\sigma_3. \tag{2}$$

If now, for (x,k) fixed, $(h(x), h'(x))$ span $\mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2$ for $h(x) = F_+, F_-, G_+, G_-$, then (2) yields (1). For $|k| \gg 1$ this is the case. Since $A(x,\lambda)$ and $B(x,\lambda)$ depend analytically on k, (1) holds for all $k \notin S$.

We next define:

Definition 8.11(Plane Waves). *For* $k \notin S$ *set* $\Psi(x,k) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} T(k) F_+(x,k)$ *for* $k \geq 0$, $\Psi(x,k) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} T(-k) F_-(x,-k)$ *for* $k < 0$. *Near* S *set* $\Psi(x,k) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \Phi_+(x,k)$ *for* $k > 0$ *and* $\Psi(x,k) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \Phi_-(x,-k)$ *for* $k < 0$.

The interpretation of the $\Psi(x,k)$ is justified by the following lemma:

Lemma 8.12. *The operator* $P_c(H_\omega)$ *has, for* ${}^tA$ *the transpose of* A, *kernel*

$$P_c(H_\omega)(x,y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[\overline{\Psi(x,k)}\ {}^t(\sigma_3 \Psi(y,k)) + \sigma_1 \overline{\Psi(x,k)}\ {}^t(\sigma_3\sigma_1\Psi(y,k)) \right] dk,$$

In particular we have $(e^{itH_\omega} P_c(H_\omega))(x,y) =$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left[e^{it(E(k)+\omega)} \overline{\Psi(x,k)}\ {}^t(\sigma_3 \Psi(y,k)) + e^{-it(E(k)+\omega)} \sigma_1 \overline{\Psi(x,k)}\ {}^t(\sigma_3\sigma_1\Psi(y,k)) \right] dk.$$

Proof. Recall $\langle f, g\rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} {}^tf(x) g(x) dx$. For $f \in L^2_c(H_\omega) \cap \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle f, g\rangle &= \lim_{\epsilon \to 0^+} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\sigma_e(H_\omega)} \langle [R_{H_\omega}(\lambda + i\epsilon) - R_{H_\omega}(\lambda - i\epsilon)] f, g\rangle d\lambda \\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\sigma_e(H_\omega)} \langle H(\lambda) f, g\rangle d\lambda \text{ with } H(\lambda) f(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} H(\lambda, x, y) f(y) dy,
\end{aligned}$$

$$H(\lambda, x, y) = R_{H_\omega}(\lambda + i0, x, y) - R_{H_\omega}(\lambda - i0, x, y).$$

We have $R_{H_\omega}(\lambda - i0, x, y) = \overline{R_{H_\omega}(\lambda + i0, x, y)}$, $\overline{F_\pm(x,k)} = F_\pm(x,-k)$. Pick now $\lambda \in \sigma_e(H_\omega)$ with $\lambda > \omega$ and $x > y$. For $k \in \mathbb{R}\backslash S$ since $G_\pm(x,k)$ has real entries for $k \in \mathbb{R}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}
H(E, x, y) = &\frac{F_+(x,-k)\ {}^t(\sigma_3 F_-(y,-k))}{[F_+(-k), F_-(-k)]} - \frac{F_+(x,k)\ {}^t(\sigma_3 F_-(y,k))}{[F_+(k), F_-(k)]} \\
&+ \frac{G_+(x,k)\ {}^t(\sigma_3 G_-(y,k))}{[G_+(k), G_-(k)]} - \frac{G_+(x,k)\ {}^t(\sigma_3 G_-(y,k))}{[G_+(k), G_-(k)]}
\end{aligned}$$

with the last line equal to 0. By Lemmas 8.5-6, for $k \notin S$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\overline{F_\pm(x,k)} = F_\pm(x,-k)\,, \overline{T(k)} = T(-k)\,, \overline{R_\pm(k)} = R_\pm(-k), \\
&F_+(x,k) = \overline{T(k) F_-(x,k) - R_+(k) F_+(x,k)}, \\
&F_-(y,-k) = T(k) F_+(y,k) - R_-(k) F_-(y,k),
\end{aligned}$$

and so we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
H(E,x,y) &= \frac{T(k)\overline{F_+(x,k)}\ {}^t(\sigma_3 F_+(y,k))}{[F_+(-k),F_-(-k)]} - \frac{\overline{T(k)F_-(x,k)}\ {}^t(\sigma_3 F_-(y,k))}{[F_+(k),F_-(k)]} \\
&- F_+(x,-k)\ {}^t(\sigma_3 F_-(y,k)) \left[\frac{R_-(k)}{[F_+(-k),F_-(-k)]} - \frac{\overline{R_+(k)}}{[F_+(k),F_-(k)]} \right].
\end{aligned}
$$

We claim that the last line is zero. Set $w_0(k) := W[\phi_+^0(k), \phi_-^0(k)]$ and multiply the bracket by $w_0(k)$. Then we get

$$
W[\phi_+^0(k), \phi_-^0(k)][\dots] = \frac{W[\phi_+^0(k), \phi_-^0(k)]}{[F_+(-k),F_-(-k)]} R_-(k) - \overline{R_-(k)} T(k).
$$

We have $W[\phi_+^0(k), \phi_-^0(k)] = W[\phi_-^0(-k), \phi_+^0(-k)] = -W[\phi_+^0(-k), \phi_-^0(-k)]$, so in particular $\overline{w}_0(k) = -w_0(k)$. Then

$$
W[\phi_+^0(k), \phi_-^0(k)][\dots] = -\left(R_+(k)\overline{T(k)} + \overline{R_-(k)}T(k) \right) = 0.
$$

This yields the claim. We pick now $\lambda > \omega$, $\lambda \in \sigma_e(H_\omega)$ with $\lambda = E(k) + \omega$ and with $k \notin S$. Picking also $x > y$ we can write by Lemma 5.5

$$
\begin{aligned}
& H(\lambda,x,y)\frac{d\lambda}{dk} = \dot{E}(k) H(\lambda,x,y) = -i w_0(k) H(\lambda,x,y) = \\
& i\frac{w_0(-k)T(k)\overline{F_+(x,k)}\ {}^t(\sigma_3 F_+(y,k))}{[F_+(-k),F_-(-k)]} + i\frac{w_0(k)\overline{T(k)F_-(x,k)}\ {}^t(\sigma_3 F_-(y,k))}{[F_+(k),F_-(k)]} \\
& = i|T(k)|^2 \left(\overline{F_+(x,k)}^t(\sigma_3 F_+(y,k)) + \overline{F_-(x,k)}^t(\sigma_3 F_-(y,k)) \right) \\
& = 2\pi i \left(\overline{\Psi(x,k)}^t(\sigma_3 \Psi(y,k)) + \overline{\Psi(x,-k)}^t(\sigma_3 \Psi(y,-k)) \right).
\end{aligned}
$$

By continuity the formula extends to any $k > 0$. The same identity holds for $x < y$. Hence for any $M > 0$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_\omega^{M^2+\omega} \left[R_{H_\omega}(\lambda - i0) - R_{H_\omega}(\lambda + i0) \right] f d\lambda = \\
& \int_0^M dk \int_{\mathbb{R}} dy \left(\overline{\Psi(x,k)}^t(\sigma_3 \Psi(y,k)) + \overline{\Psi(x,-k)}^t(\sigma_3 \Psi(y,-k)) \right) f(y).
\end{aligned}
$$

Repeating the argument for $E < -\omega$ and for $M \to \infty$ we conclude the proof.

Lemma 8.13. *The following operators* $P_{\pm}(\omega)$ *are well defined in* L^2_x*:*

$$\begin{aligned} P_+(\omega)u &= \lim_{M\nearrow\infty}\lim_{\epsilon\searrow 0}\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{[\omega,M]\cap(\omega+\sigma(h_0))}\left[R_{H_\omega}(\lambda+i\epsilon)-R_{H_\omega}(\lambda-i\epsilon)\right]ud\lambda \\ P_-(\omega)u &= \lim_{M\nearrow\infty}\lim_{\epsilon\searrow 0}\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{[-M,-\omega]\cap(-\omega-\sigma(h_0))}\left[R_{H_\omega}(\lambda+i\epsilon)-R_{H_\omega}(\lambda-i\epsilon)\right]ud\lambda \end{aligned}$$

and have kernel

$$\begin{aligned} P_+(\omega)(x,y) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}}\overline{\Psi(x,k)}\ {}^t\,(\sigma_3\Psi(y,k))dk, \\ P_-(\omega)(x,y) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}}\sigma_1\overline{\Psi(x,k)}\ {}^t\,(\sigma_3\sigma_1\Psi(y,k))dk. \end{aligned}$$

For any $M>0$ *and* $N>0$ *and for* $C=C(N,M,\omega)$ *upper semicontinuous in* ω*, we have*

$$\|\langle x\rangle^M(P_+(\omega)-P_-(\omega)-P_c(H_\omega)\sigma_3)f\|_{L^2_x}\le C\|\langle x\rangle^{-N}f\|_{L^2_x}. \tag{1}$$

Proof. The first two statements follow from the argument of Lemma 8.12 and from §7. Now we want to prove (1). The proof is similar to Lemma 5.12 [C1]. For this proof we set $H=H_\omega$, $H_0=\sigma_3(h_0+\omega)$, $R_0(z)=(H_0-z)^{-1}$ and $R(z)=(H-z)^{-1}$. To prove (1) it is enough to write $P_c=P_++P_-$ and to prove $\|\left[P_\pm\sigma_3\mp P_\pm\right]g\|_{L^{2,M}_x}\le c\|g\|_{L^{2,-N}_x}$. It is not restrictive to consider only P_+. Setting $H=H_0+V$, we write

$$\sum_\pm \pm R(\lambda\pm i\epsilon)=\sum_\pm \pm(1+R_0(\lambda\pm i\epsilon)V)^{-1}R_0(\lambda\pm i\epsilon). \tag{2}$$

By elementary computation

$$R_0(\lambda\pm i\epsilon)\sigma_3=R_0(\lambda\pm i\epsilon)-2(h_0+\omega+\lambda\pm i\epsilon)^{-1}\mathrm{diag}(0,1).$$

Therefore

$$\mathrm{rhs}(2)\sigma_3=\mathrm{rhs}\,(4)+2\sum_\pm\pm(1+R_0(\lambda\pm i\epsilon)V)^{-1}\mathrm{diag}(0,1)R_{h_0}(-\omega-\lambda\mp i\epsilon).$$

Hence we are reduced to show that

$$Ku=$$

$$\lim_{M\to\infty}\lim_{\epsilon\to 0^+}\sum_\pm\pm\int_{[\omega,M]\cap\sigma(H_0)}(1+R_0(\lambda\pm i\epsilon)V)^{-1}\mathrm{diag}(0,1)R_{h_0}(-\omega-\lambda\mp i\epsilon)ud\lambda$$

defines an operator such that for some fixed c

$$\|Ku\|_{L^{2,M}_x} \le c\|u\|_{L^{2,-N}_x} \tag{3}$$

For $m \ge 1$ we expand $(1+R_0V)^{-1} = \sum_{j=0}^{m+1} [-R_0V]^j + R_0VRV(-R_0V)^m$ and we consider the corresponding decomposition

$$K = \sum_{j=0}^{m+1} K^0_j + \mathcal{K}. \tag{4}$$

We have $K^0_0 = 0$ since for any $u \in L^2_x$ we have

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0^+} \int_{[\omega,M]\cap\sigma(H_0)} \sum_{\pm} \pm(h_0+\omega+\lambda\pm i\epsilon)^{-1}\text{diag}(0,1)ud\lambda = 0.$$

We next consider K^0_j for $j \in [1,m]$ and prove

$$\|K^0_j u\|_{L^{2,M}_x} \le c\|u\|_{L^{2,-N}_x}. \tag{5}$$

For definiteness we consider $j = 1$, in fact the other cases are similar. We have

$$K^0_1 u = \int_{\omega+\sigma(h_0)} [R_0(\lambda+i0) - R_0(\lambda-i0)]\, VR_{h_0}(-\omega-\lambda)\text{diag}(0,1)ud\lambda.$$

We also have

$$K^0_1 u = \sum_{j=1}^{n_0} K^0_{1,j}u, \text{ with } K^0_{1,j}u = \int_{\partial r_j} R_0(z)V(h_0+2\omega+z)^{-1}\text{diag}(0,1)udz \tag{6}$$

with $\{r_j, j < n_0\}$ thin rectangles , with sides parallel to the coordinate axes, with each r_j containing the j'th spectral band of h_0 in its interior and disjoint from all the other bands. r_{n_0} is an unbounded strip containing the unbounded spectral band in its interior. We prove (5) for each $K^0_{1,j}$. Take $j < n_0$. Schematically

$$K^0_{1,j}u = \int_{\partial r_j} R_{h_0}(z)VR_{h_0}(-2\omega-z)udz \tag{7}$$

where now V is a scalar exponentially decreasing function and u is a scalar function. But over ∂r_j we have that the resolvents in (7) have kernel in absolute value bounded by $\beta e^{-\alpha|x-y|}$ for some fixed $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta > 0$. Since the length of ∂r_j is finite, for some C and for $j < n_0$

$$|K^0_{1,j}u(x)| \le C\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{-\alpha|x-t|}V(t)e^{-\alpha|t-y|}u(y)dtdy. \tag{8}$$

For the latter operator one gets easily (5). Next we consider $j = n_0$. Once again we focus on (7). Notice that for u a Schwarz function we have that (7) for $j = n_0$ converges in $L^{2,s}_x$ space for $s > 1/2$ because the integrand decays like $\langle \lambda \rangle^{-3/2}$. Using the fact that for $N \geq 1$

$$\int_{N-iN^2}^{N+iN^2} \langle z \rangle^{-\frac{3}{2}} |dz| \leq C \langle N \rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}},$$

we conclude that we can deform the path integral replacing r_{n_0} with any region r defined by $x \geq c$, $|y| \leq \alpha x^2$, with $\alpha > 0$ and the halfplane $x \geq c$ containing in its interior the unbounded band and disjoint from the bounded bands. Then

$$K^0_{1,n_0} u = \int_\sigma R_{h_0}(E(k)) V R_{h_0}(-2\omega - E(k)) u \dot{E}(k) dk$$

with for $k = a + ib$, σ the union of two paths of the form $b = b_0 >$, $a \in [\pi n(n_0), \infty)$ and $a \in (-\infty, -\pi n(n_0)]$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &|K^0_{1,n_0} u(x)| \leq C(A + B) \text{ with} \\ &A = \int_{|y-t| \leq 1} dy dt \int_{a \geq \pi n(n_0)} \frac{da}{a} e^{-b_0 |x-t|} V(t) e^{-a|y-t|} |u(y)| \\ &B = \int_{|y-t| \geq 1} dy dt \int_{a \geq \pi n(n_0)} \frac{da}{a} e^{-b_0 |x-t|} V(t) e^{-a|y-t|} |u(y)|. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle x \rangle^M A \lesssim \int_{|y-t| \leq 1} dy dt \langle t \rangle^{M+N} |V(t)| e^{-\frac{b_0}{2}|x-t|} \left|\log(|y-t|)\right| \langle y \rangle^{-N} |u(y)| \\ &\lesssim \|u\|_{L^{2,-N}_x} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle x \rangle^M B \lesssim \int_{|y-t| \geq 1} dy dt \langle t \rangle^{M+N} |V(t)| e^{-\frac{b_0}{2}|x-t| - \frac{\pi n(n_0)}{2}|y-t|} \langle y \rangle^{-N} |u(y)| \\ &\lesssim \|u\|_{L^{2,-N}_x}. \end{aligned}$$

This yields (3) also for K^0_{1,n_0}. Finally we focus on

$$\begin{aligned} &(-)^m \mathcal{K} u = \sum_{\pm} \\ &\pm \int_{\omega + \sigma(h_0)} R^{\pm}_0(\lambda) V R^{\pm}(\lambda) V \left[R^{\pm}_0(\lambda) V \right]^m \operatorname{diag}(0,1) R_{h_0}(-\omega - \lambda)^{-1} u d\lambda \\ &= \sum_j \int_{\partial r_j} R_0(\zeta) V R(\zeta) V \left[R_0(\zeta) V \right]^m \operatorname{diag}(0,1) R_{h_0}(-\omega - \zeta) u d\zeta. \end{aligned}$$

We have $\|V R(\zeta) V\|_{B(L^{2,-N}_x, L^{2,N}_x)} \lesssim \langle z \rangle^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ for all N and by repeating the previous argument, deforming ∂r_{n_0} we obtain also $\|\mathcal{K}\|_{B(L^{2,-N}_x, L^{2,M}_x)} < \infty$ for all M and N.

§9 Proof of Lemmas 3.1-3.2

Lemma 3.1 is a consequence of the following statement:

Lemma 9.1. *Set* $P_c(H_\omega)e^{itH_\omega}(x,y) = \mathcal{U}(t,x,y) + \mathcal{V}(t,x,y)$ *with*

$$\mathcal{U}(t,x,y) = \int_{|k|\le \pi n(n_0)} e^{itE(k)}\phi(x,y,k)dk\,,$$

$$\mathcal{V}(t,x,y) = \int_{|k|\ge \pi n(n_0)} e^{itE(k)}\phi(x,y,k)dk$$

$$\text{with } \phi(x,y,k) = \overline{\Psi(x,k)}\ {}^t(\sigma_3\Psi(y,k)) + \sigma_1\overline{\Psi(x,k)}\ {}^t(\sigma_3\sigma_1\Psi(y,k)).$$

Then $|\mathcal{U}(t,x,y)| \le C\langle t\rangle^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ *and* $|\mathcal{V}(t,x,y)| \le C|t|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$.

Proof. Using cutoff functions we distinguish between k close to S and k away from S. In the latter case the proof is the same of Lemma 6.5. So for $\chi(k)$ a smooth cutoff function with small support I with $I\cap S = \{\widehat{k}\}$ and with $I \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ (the above choices are not restrictive) contained either in $|k| < \pi n(n_0)$ or in $|k| > \pi n(n_0)$, we consider the integral

$$\int_I e^{itE(k)}\chi(k)\overline{\Phi}_+(x,k)\ {}^t\Phi_-(y,k)\,dk. \tag{1}$$

Notice that by (8.6)

$$\Phi_+(x,k) = \phi^0_\pm(x,k)\overrightarrow{e}_1(1+A(x,k)) + \phi^0_-(x,k)B(x,k) + C(x,y,k)$$

with $|\partial_k^a A(x,k)| + |\partial_k^a B(x,k)| + |\partial_k^a C(x,y,k)| < c_0$ for fixed c_0 for $a = 0,1$. Then by stationary phase $|(1)| \le \langle t\rangle^{-\alpha}$ with α either 1/2 if I is in $|k| < \pi n(n_0)$ or 1/3 if I in $|k| > \pi n(n_0)$.

Before proving Lemma 3.2 we need:

Lemma 9.1. *Let* $I_{\alpha,\beta}[f] = K_{\alpha,\beta}(t) * f$ *with* $K_{\alpha,\beta} \equiv \chi_{[0,1)}t^{-\alpha} + \chi_{[1,\infty)}t^{-\beta}$ *for given* $0 < \alpha < 1$ *and* $0 < \beta < 1$. *Then we have the following estimates:*

$$\|I_{\alpha,\beta}[f]\|_{\ell^p(\mathbb{Z},L^r_t[n,n+1])} \le C\|f\|_{\ell^q(\mathbb{Z},L^s_t[n,n+1])}$$

where $C \equiv C(p,q,r,s) > 0$ *and*

$$1 + \frac{1}{r} \ge \alpha + \frac{1}{s} \tag{1}$$

$$1 + \frac{1}{p} \le \beta + \frac{1}{q} \tag{2}$$

$$(r,s) \ne \left(\infty, \frac{1}{1-\alpha}\right), \left(\frac{1}{\alpha}, 1\right) \tag{3}$$

$$(p,q) \ne \left(\infty, \frac{1}{1-\beta}\right), \left(\frac{1}{\beta}, 1\right). \tag{4}$$

If moreover we assume $\alpha = 0$ *and* $0 < \beta < 1$ *then*

$$\|I_{0,\beta}f\|_{\ell^p(\mathbb{Z},L^r_t[n,n+1])} \leq C\|f\|_{\ell^q(\mathbb{Z},L^s_t[n,n+1])}$$

where $1 \leq r, s \leq \infty$ *and* $1 \leq p, q \leq \infty$ *satisfy (2) and (4).*

The elementary proof is in Lemma 2.2 [GV].

Proof of Lemma 3.2. Using the definition of $\mathcal{U}(t)$ and $\mathcal{V}(t)$, the proof of the Strichartz estimates for (2) and (4) Lemma 3.2 are the same of that in Lemma 3.1 in [C1]. We turn now to the estimate for $\mathcal{U}(t)$. In the sequel the pairs (r,p), (r_1,p_1) and (r_2,p_2) are always admissible. First of all, by $[H_\omega, \mathcal{U}(t)] = 0$, it is not restrictive to consider only case $k = 0$. We set $P_\pm = P_\pm(H_\omega)$. We have $[\mathcal{U}, P_\pm] = 0$, $\mathcal{U}^*\sigma_3 = \sigma_3\mathcal{U}$, $P^*_\pm\sigma_3 = \sigma_3 P_\pm$.

First step: proof of (1) Lemma 3.2. The case $(r,p) = (\infty, 2)$ is trivial, hence by interpolation it suffices to prove (1) in the case $(r,p) = (4,\infty)$. By Lemma 3.1

$$\left\|\int_0^\infty \mathcal{U}(t-s)F(s)ds\right\|_{L^\infty_x} \leq C\int_0^\infty \|F(s)\|_{L^1_x}\frac{ds}{\langle t-s\rangle^{\frac{1}{3}}}.$$

By Lemma 9.1 with $\alpha = 0$ and $\beta = \frac{1}{3}$

$$\left\|\int_0^\infty \mathcal{U}(t-s)F(s)ds\right\|_{\ell^6(\mathbb{Z},L^\infty_t([n,n+1],L^\infty_x))} \leq C\|F\|_{\ell^{\frac{6}{5}}(\mathbb{Z},L^1_t([n,n+1],L^1_x))}. \tag{9.1}$$

By Fubini theorem we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\langle\int_0^\infty \mathcal{U}(s)P_\pm F(s)ds, \sigma_3\int_0^\infty \mathcal{U}(t)P_\pm F(t)dt\right\rangle_x\\ &= \left\langle\int_0^\infty \mathcal{U}(t-s)P_\pm F(s)ds, \sigma_3 P_\pm F(t)\right\rangle_{t,x}.\end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\int_0^\infty \mathcal{U}(s)F(s)ds\right\|^2_{L^2_x} &\lesssim \left\|\int_0^\infty \mathcal{U}(t-s)F(s)ds\right\|_{\ell^6(\mathbb{Z},L^\infty_t([n,n+1],L^\infty_x))}\times\\ \|F\|_{\ell^{\frac{6}{5}}(\mathbb{Z},L^1_t([n,n+1],L^1_x))} &\leq C\|F\|^2_{\ell^{\frac{6}{5}}(\mathbb{Z},L^1_t([n,n+1],L^1_x))}\end{aligned} \tag{9.2}$$

by (9.1) and by $\|P_\pm u\|^2_{L^2_x} \approx |\langle P_\pm u, \sigma_3 P_\pm u\rangle|$. The latter follows from the following facts, for W and Z the operators in Proposition 7.1: for $u \in L^2_c(H_\omega)$ and $u = Wv$, we have $\|P_+u\|_{L^2_x} \approx \|\mathrm{diag}(1,0)v\|_{L^2_x}$, $\|P_-u\|_{L^2_x} \approx \|\mathrm{diag}(0,1)v\|_{L^2_x}$; for any pair $\widetilde{u} = W\widetilde{v}$ we have $\langle \widetilde{u}, \sigma_3 \widetilde{u}\rangle = \langle \widetilde{v}, \sigma_3 \widetilde{v}\rangle$.

To finally deduce (1) Lemma 3.2, notice that by combining the Fubini theorem, a duality argument, the Hölder inequality and (9.2), we get for $f \in L^2_c(H_\omega)$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\mathcal{U}(t)f\|_{\ell^6(\mathbb{Z}, L^\infty_t([n,n+1], L^\infty_x))} = \sup_{G \in \mathcal{B}_{\frac{6}{5},1,1}} \langle \mathcal{U}(t)f, \sigma_3 G(t,x)\rangle_{t,x} \\
&= \sup_{G \in \mathcal{B}_{\frac{6}{5},1,1}} \left\langle f, \sigma_3 \int_0^\infty \mathcal{U}(t) P_c(H_\omega) G(t) dt \right\rangle_x \\
&\leq \|f\|_{L^2_x} \sup_{G \in \mathcal{B}_{\frac{6}{5},1,1}} \left\| \int_0^\infty \mathcal{U}(t) P_c(H_\omega) G(t) dt \right\|_{L^2_x} \leq C\|f\|_{L^2_x},
\end{aligned}$$

where:

$$\mathcal{B}_{\frac{6}{5},1,1} := \left\{ G \in \ell^{\frac{6}{5}}(\mathbb{Z}, L^1_t([n,n+1], L^1_x)) \text{ s.t. } \|G\|_{\ell^{\frac{6}{5}}(\mathbb{Z}, L^1_t([n,n+1], L^1_x))} = 1 \right\}.$$

Second step: proof of (3) Lemma 3.2. We split the proof 7 subcases.

First subcase: $(r_i, p_i) = (\infty, 2)$ *for* $i = 1, 2$. In this case the estimate (3) Lemma 3.2 is equivalent to the following one:

$$\left\| \int_0^t \mathcal{U}(t-s) F(s) ds \right\|_{L^\infty_t L^2_x} \leq C\|F\|_{L^1_t L^2_x}$$

whose proof is elementary:

$$\left\| \int_0^t \mathcal{U}(t-s) F(s) ds \right\|_{L^2_x} \leq \int_0^t \|\mathcal{U}(t-s)F(s)\|_{L^2_x} ds \leq C \int_0^t \|F(s)\|_{L^2_x} ds,$$

where we have used the fact that $\|\mathcal{U}(t)f\|_{L^2_x} \leq C\|f\|_{L^2_x}$ for a fixed C.

Second subcase: $(r_i, p_i) = (4, \infty)$ *for* $i = 1, 2$. It is similar to the proof of (9.1).

Third subcase: $(r_1, p_1) = (4, \infty)$ *and* $(r_2, p_2) = (\infty, 2)$. In this case (3) Lemma 3.2 reduces to:

$$\left\| \int_0^t \mathcal{U}(t-s) F(s) ds \right\|_{\ell^6(\mathbb{Z}, L^\infty_t([n,n+1], L^\infty_x))} \leq C\|F\|_{L^1_t L^2_x}. \tag{9.3}$$

Notice that we have the identity:

$$\int_0^t \mathcal{U}(t-s) F(s) ds = \int_0^\infty \chi(t-s) \mathcal{U}(t-s) F(s) ds,$$

with χ is the characteristic function of the half line $(0,\infty)$. By the Minkowski inequality we get

$$\left\|\int_0^t \mathcal{U}(t-s)F(s)ds\right\|_{\ell^6(\mathbb{Z},L_t^\infty([n,n+1],L_x^\infty))}$$

$$\leq \int_0^\infty \|\chi(t-s)\mathcal{U}(t-s)F(s)\|_{\ell^6(\mathbb{Z},L_t^\infty([n,n+1],L_x^\infty))}ds$$

$$\leq \int_0^\infty \|\mathcal{U}(t-s)F(s)\|_{\ell^6(\mathbb{Z},L_t^\infty([n,n+1],L_x^\infty))}\ ds \leq C\int_0^\infty \|F(s)\|_{L_x^2}ds$$

where we have used (1) Lemma 3.2 at the last step.

Fourth subcase: (r_1,p_1) *any admissible pair and* $(r_2,p_2)=(\infty,2)$. Follows by interpolation between the first the third subcases.

Fifth subcase: $(r_1,p_1)=(\infty,2)$, $(r_2,p_2)=(4,\infty)$. Follows by a duality argument. In fact we have

$$\left\|\int_0^t \mathcal{U}(t-s)F(s)ds\right\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} = \sup_{G\in\mathcal{B}_{1,2}}\left\langle \int_0^t \mathcal{U}(t-s)F(s)ds, \sigma_3 G\right\rangle_{t,x} =$$

$$= \sup_{G\in\mathcal{B}_{1,2}}\left\langle F, \sigma_3\int_t^\infty \mathcal{U}(t-s)G(s)ds\right\rangle_{t,x},$$

where

$$\mathcal{B}_{1,2} := \left\{G\in L_t^1L_x^2 \text{ s.t. } \|G\|_{L_t^1L_x^2}=1\right\}.$$

By Hölder inequality

$$\left\|\int_0^t \mathcal{U}(t-s)F(s)ds\right\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^2} \leq \|F\|_{\ell^{\frac{6}{5}}(\mathbb{Z},L_t^1([n,n+1],L_x^1))}\times$$

$$\sup_{G\in\mathcal{B}_{1,2}}\left\|\int_t^\infty \mathcal{U}(t-s)G(s)ds\right\|_{\ell^6(\mathbb{Z},L_t^\infty([n,n+1],L_x^\infty))} \leq C\|F\|_{\ell^{\frac{6}{5}}(\mathbb{Z},L_t^1([n,n+1],L_x^1))},$$

where at the last step we used the estimate

$$\left\|\int_t^\infty \mathcal{U}(t-s)G(s)ds\right\|_{\ell^6(\mathbb{Z},L_t^\infty([n,n+1],L_x^\infty))} \leq C\|G\|_{L_t^1L_x^2},$$

whose proof is similar to (9.3).

Sixth subcase: (r_1,p_1) *any admissible pair and* $(r_2,p_2)=(4,\infty)$. Follows by interpolation of second and fifth case.

Seventh subcase: remaining cases. Follows by interpolation of fourth and sixth cases.

§10 Extension of a result by Christ and Kiselev to Birman-Solomjak spaces

Given two Banach spaces X and Y let $K(s,t)$ be a continuous function with values in $B(X,Y)$. Let us introduce the operators:

$$T_K f(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} K(t,s) f(s) ds$$

and

$$\tilde{T}_K f(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{t} K(t,s) f(s) ds.$$

In this section we shall prove the following modified version of Lemma 3.1 [SmS].

Proposition 10.1. *Let* $1 \leq p, q, r \leq \infty$ *be such that* $1 \leq r < \min\{p,q\} \leq \infty$. *Assume that there exist* $C > 0$ *such that:*

$$\|T_K f\|_{\ell^q(\mathbb{Z}, L^p_t([n,n+1],Y))} \leq C \|f\|_{L^r_t(X)}, \tag{10.1}$$

then

$$\|\tilde{T}_K f\|_{\ell^q(\mathbb{Z}, L^p_t([n,n+1],Y))} \leq C' \|f\|_{L^r_t(X)}, \tag{10.2}$$

where $C' = C'(C, p, q, r) > 0$ *is another suitable constant.*

Remark. In the case $p = q$ the previous proposition follows from [CK].

We shall need the following lemma.

Lemma 10.2. *Let* $k \in \mathbb{N}$ *and* $1 \leq p, q, r \leq \infty$ *as in Proposition 10.1. Assume that* $\{I_j\}_{j=1,\dots,2^k} \subset \mathbb{R}$ *is a family of intervals (eventually unbounded) such that:*

$$\mathbb{R} = \cup_j I_j \text{ and } int I_j \cap int I_k = \emptyset \text{ for } j \neq k.$$

Assume also that $g_j \in \ell^q(\mathbb{Z}, L^p_t([n,n+1],Y))$ *for* $j = 1, .., 2^k$ *is a family of functions such that*

$$\|g_j\|_{\ell^q(\mathbb{Z}, L^p_t([n,n+1],Y))} \leq C 2^{-\frac{k}{r}} \; \forall j = 1, ..., 2^k. \tag{10.3}$$

Then the following estimate holds:

$$\|\sum_{j=1}^{2^k} \chi_{I_j} g_j\|_{\ell^q(\mathbb{Z}, L^p_t([n,n+1],Y))} \leq C' 2^{k(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{Min\{p,q\}}{qr})} \tag{10.4}$$

where $C' = C'(C, p, q, r) > 0$ *and in particular* C' *does not depend on* g_j, I_j, k.

Proof. Let us fix the following notations:

$$G(x) \equiv \sum_{j=1}^{2^k} \chi_{I_j} g_j \tag{10.5}$$

and

$$\mathcal{I} \equiv \{I_j \text{ for } j = 0, 1, ..., 2^k\},$$

where I_j are the intervals given in the statement and $I_0 \equiv \emptyset$. To every $I_j \in \mathcal{I}$ we associate a new segment $\tilde{I}_j \subset I_j$ defined as follows:

$$\tilde{I}_j \equiv (z_j, z_{j+1})$$

where $z_j, z_{j+1} \in \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$, $z_j \equiv \inf\{z \in \mathbb{Z} \cup \{-\infty\} | z \in I_j\}$ and $z_{j+1} \equiv \sup\{z \in \mathbb{Z} \cup \{+\infty\} | z \in I_j\}$. Notice that the possibility $\tilde{I}_j = \emptyset$ is allowed. Next we introduce

$$\tilde{\mathcal{I}} \equiv \{I_j \in \mathcal{I} | \tilde{I}_j \neq \emptyset\}$$

and also

$$\tilde{\mathbb{Z}} \equiv \{z \in \mathbb{Z} | (z, z+1) \cap (\cup_{j=1}^{2^k} \tilde{I}_j) = \emptyset\}. \tag{10.6}$$

Notice that in a more explicit way we can write

$$\tilde{\mathcal{I}} = \{I_{i_0}, I_{i_1}, ..., I_{i_h}\}$$

for suitable $0 \leq h \leq 2^k$ and $0 = i_0 < i_1 < ... < i_h \leq 2^k$. For every function $F \in l^q(\mathbb{Z}, L^p_t([n, n+1], Y))$ we get:

$$\|\chi_{(\cup_{I_j \in \tilde{I}} \tilde{I}_j)} F\|_{\ell^q(\mathbb{Z}, L^p_t([n,n+1],Y))} = \left(\sum_{j=i_0,\dots,i_h} \|\chi_{\tilde{I}_j} F\|^q_{\ell^q(\mathbb{Z}, L^p_t([n,n+1],Y))} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}.$$

In particular if we choose in this identity $F = G$, with G as in (10.5), then we get:

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\chi_{(\cup_{I_j \in \tilde{I}} \tilde{I}_j)} G\|^q_{\ell^q(\mathbb{Z}, L^p_t([n,n+1],Y))} = \|\chi_{(\cup_{I_j \in \tilde{I}} \tilde{I}_j)} (\sum_{l=1}^{2^k} \chi_{I_l} g_l)\|^q_{\ell^q(\mathbb{Z}, L^p_t([n,n+1],Y))} \\ &= \sum_{j=i_0,i_1,\dots,i_h} \|\chi_{\tilde{I}_j} g_j\|^q_{\ell^q(\mathbb{Z}, L^p_t([n,n+1],Y))} \\ &\leq \sum_{j=i_0,i_1,\dots,i_h} \|g_j\|^q_{\ell^q(\mathbb{Z}, L^p_t([n,n+1],Y))} \leq C^q h 2^{-\frac{kq}{r}} \end{aligned} \tag{10.7}$$

where we have used the assumption (10.3). Next we shall estimate

$$\|\chi_{\mathbb{R}\setminus(\cup_{I_j\in\tilde{\mathcal{I}}}\tilde{I}_j)}G\|_{l^q(\mathbb{Z},L^p_t([n,n+1],Y))},$$

with G as in (10.5). In order to do that let us associate to any integer $n_0\in\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}$, defined in (10.6), the following set:

$$\mathcal{I}_{n_0}\equiv\{I\in\mathcal{I}|I\cap(n_0,n_0+1)\neq\emptyset\}.$$

In particular we can write in a more explicit way:

$$\mathcal{I}_{n_0}\equiv\{I_{i(n_0)},I_{i(n_0)+1}...,I_{i(n_0)+h(n_0))}\}$$

where

$$0\leq h(n_0)\leq 2^k, i(n_0)\in 1,...,2^k.$$

It is easy to deduce that the assumptions on $\{I_j\}_{j=1,..,2^k}$ imply:

$$0\leq h\leq 2^k \text{ and } \sum_{n_0\in\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}}h(n_0)\leq 2^{k+1}. \tag{10.8}$$

Next notice that for every $n_0\in\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\chi_{(n_0,n_0+1)}G\|^p_{L^p([n_0,n_0+1],Y)}=\sum_{J\in\mathcal{I}_{n_0}}\|\chi_{J\cap[n_0,n_0+1]}G\|^p_{L^p([n_0,n_0+1],Y)}\\
&=\sum_{h=0}^{h(n_0)}\|\chi_{I_{i(n_0)+h}\cap[n_0,n_0+1]}g_{i(n_0)+h}\|^p_{L^p([n_0,n_0+1],Y)}\\
&\leq\sum_{h=0}^{h(n_0)}\|g_{i(n_0)+h}\|^p_{L^p([n_0,n_0+1],Y)}\leq C^p(h(n_0)+1)2^{-\frac{kp}{r}}
\end{aligned}$$

and this implies

$$\|\chi_{(n_0,n_0+1)}G\|^q_{L^p([n_0,n_0+1],Y)}\leq C^q2^{\frac{q}{p}}2^{-\frac{kq}{r}}h(n_0)^{\frac{q}{p}}=C^q2^{\frac{q}{p}}(2^{-\frac{kp}{r}}h(n_0))^{\frac{q}{p}}. \tag{10.9}$$

Next we split the proof of (10.4) in two cases.

First case: $q\geq p$
In this case we have the following estimate:

$$C^q2^{\frac{q}{p}}(2^{-\frac{kp}{r}}h(n_0))^{\frac{q}{p}}\leq C^q2^{\frac{q}{p}}2^{-\frac{kp}{r}}h(n_0), \tag{10.10}$$

where at the last step we have used the assumption $q \geq p$ and the following fact

$$2^{-\frac{kp}{r}} h(n_0) \leq 2^{-k} h(n_0) \leq 1,$$

that in turn follows from the hypothesis $p > r$ and $0 \leq h(n_0) \leq 2^k$.
By combining (10.7) with (10.9) and (10.10) we get:

$$\|G\|^q_{\ell^q(\mathbb{Z}, L^p_t([n,n+1],Y))} = \|\chi_{(\cup_{I_j \in \tilde{I}} \tilde{I}_j)} G\|^q_{\ell^q(\mathbb{Z}, L^p_t([n,n+1],Y))} + \sum_{n_0 \in \tilde{\mathbb{R}}} \|G\|^q_{L^p([n_0,n_0+1],Y)}$$

$$\leq C^q 2^{-\frac{kq}{r}} h + \sum_{n_0 \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}} C^q 2^{\frac{q}{p}} 2^{-\frac{kp}{r}} h(n_0),$$

that due to (10.8) implies:

$$\|G\|^q_{\ell^q(\mathbb{Z}, L^p_t([n,n+1],Y))} \leq C^q 2^{k(1-\frac{q}{r})} + 2C^q 2^{\frac{q}{p}} 2^{k(1-\frac{p}{r})}.$$

Hence, due to the hypothesis $q \geq p > r$, we get:

$$\|G\|^q_{\ell^q(\mathbb{Z}, L^p_t([n,n+1],Y))} \leq 3C^q 2^{\frac{q}{p}} 2^{k(1-\frac{p}{r})}.$$

Second case: $q < p$
In this case we have

$$C^q 2^{\frac{q}{p}} (2^{-\frac{kp}{r}} h(n_0))^{\frac{q}{p}} = C^q 2^{\frac{q}{p}} 2^{-\frac{kq}{r}} h(n_0)^{\frac{q}{p}} \leq C^q 2^{\frac{q}{p}} 2^{-\frac{kq}{r}} h(n_0) \tag{10.11}$$

where at the last step we have used $h(n_0) \geq 1$ and $q < p$. By combining (10.7) with (10.9) and (10.11) we get:

$$\|G\|^q_{\ell^q(\mathbb{Z}, L^p_t([n,n+1],Y))} = \|\chi_{(\cup_{I_j \in \tilde{I}} \tilde{I}_j)} G\|^q_{\ell^q(\mathbb{Z}, L^p_t([n,n+1],Y))} + \sum_{n_0 \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}} \|G\|^q_{L^p([n_0,n_0+1],Y)}$$

$$\leq C^q 2^{-\frac{kq}{r}} h + \sum_{n_0 \in \tilde{\mathbb{Z}}} C^q 2^{\frac{q}{p}} 2^{-\frac{kq}{r}} h(n_0) \leq 3C^q 2^{\frac{q}{p}} 2^{k(1-\frac{q}{r})},$$

where at the last step we have used (10.8).

Proof of Prop 10.1. We shall follow the notations used in [SmS]. Let $f \in L^r_t(X)$ satisfies the following conditions:

(1) $\|f\|_{L^r_t(X)} = 1$;
(2) the function $F(t)$ defined below is a bijection between $(-\infty, \infty)$ and $(0, 1)$,

$$F(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{t} \|f(s)\|^r_X ds. \tag{10.12}$$

By an elementary density argument we have that (10.2) will follow once we show that $\|\tilde{T}_K f\|_{\ell^q(\mathbb{Z},L^p_t([n,n+1],Y))} \leq C'$ for any $f \in L^r_t(X)$ that satisfies the conditions above. Next we consider the set of all dyadic subintervals of $[0,1]$. If I and J are two such subintervals, we say that $I \sim J$ if the following conditions hold:

(1) I and J have the same lenght;

(2) I must lie on the left of J;

(3) there exist two dyadic cubes I_0 and J_0 whose lenght is twice the lenght of I and J, and moreover I_0 and J_0 are adiacent.

Notice that if J is fixed then there are two dyadic intervals such that $I \sim J$. Following [CK,SmS] we can write the identity

$$\tilde{T}_K f = \sum_{\{I,J:I\sim J\}} \chi_{F^{-1}J} T_K(\chi_{F^{-1}I} f),$$

where χ_A denotes the characteristic function of the set A and $F(t)$ is given in (10.12). Due to the Minkowski inequality we get:

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\tilde{T}_K f\|_{\ell^q(\mathbb{Z},L^p_t([n,n+1],Y))} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \| \sum_{\{I,J:I\sim J,|I|=2^{-k}\}} \chi_{F^{-1}J} T(\chi_{F^{-1}I} f)\|_{\ell^q(\mathbb{Z},L^p_t([n,n+1],Y))}. \end{aligned} \tag{10.13}$$

Next for every $k \geq 2$ we fix the following notations:

$$I^k_j \equiv F^{-1}\left(\frac{j}{2^k}, \frac{j+1}{2^k}\right) \text{ for } j = 0, 1, ..., 2^k - 1,$$

$$f^k_j = \chi_{I^k_j} f \text{ and } g^k_j = T_K(f^k_j).$$

Notice that

$$\|f^k_j\|_{L^r_t(X)} = 2^{-\frac{k}{r}} \quad \forall j = 0, 1, ..., 2^k - 1$$

and due to the assumption (10.2) we deduce:

$$\begin{aligned} &\|g^k_j\|_{\ell^q(\mathbb{Z},L^p_t([n,n+1],Y))} \\ &= \|T_K(f^k_j)\|_{\ell^q(\mathbb{Z},L^p_t([n,n+1],Y))} \leq C2^{-\frac{k}{r}} \quad \forall j = 0, ..., 2^k - 1. \end{aligned}$$

We are then in position to use Lemma 10.2 in order to deduce:

$$\begin{aligned} &\| \sum_{\{I,J:I\sim J,|I|=2^{-k}\}} \chi_{F^{-1}J} T_K(\chi_{F^{-1}I} f)\|_{\ell^q(\mathbb{Z},L^p_t([n,n+1],Y))} \\ &= \| \sum_{j=2,\dots,2^k-1} \chi_{I^k_{j-1}} g^k_j(x) + \sum_{j=2,\dots,2^k-1} \chi_{I^k_{j-2}} g^k_j(x)\|_{\ell^q(\mathbb{Z},L^p_t([n,n+1],Y))} \\ &\leq \| \sum_{j=2,\dots,2^k} \chi_{I^k_{j-1}} g^k_j(x)\|_{\ell^q(\mathbb{Z},L^p_t([n,n+1],Y))} + \| \sum_{j=2,\dots,2^k} \chi_{I^k_{j-2}} g^k_j(x)\|_{\ell^q(\mathbb{Z},L^p_t([n,n+1],Y))} \\ &\leq 2C'2^{k(\frac{1}{q}-\frac{Min\{p,q\}}{qr})}. \end{aligned}$$

By (10.13) we finally get

$$\|\tilde{T}_K f\|_{\ell^q(\mathbb{Z},L^p_t([n,n+1],Y))} \leq 2C' \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} 2^{k(\frac{1}{q}-\frac{Min\{p,q\}}{qr})}$$

and since $\frac{1}{q}-\frac{Min\{p,q\}}{qr}<0$ we have the desired result.

References

[BP1] V.S. Buslaev, G.S.Perelman, *Scattering for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation: states close to a soliton*, St. Petersburg Math.J. **4** (1993), 1111–1142.

[BP2] ______, *On the stability of solitary waves for nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, Nonlinear evolution equations (N.N. Uraltseva, eds.), Transl. Ser. 2, 164, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1995, pp. 75–98.

[BR] J. Bronski, Z.Rapti, *Modulation instability for nonlinear Schrödinger equation with a periodic potential*, Dy. Partial Diff. Equ.. **2** (2005), 335–355.

[BS] V.S.Buslaev, C.Sulem, *On the asymptotic stability of solitary waves of Nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré. An. Nonlin. **20** (2003), 419–475.

[Ca] T.Cazenave, *Semilinear Schrödinger equations*, Courant Lecture Notes, Amer. Math. Soc., 2003.

[CK] M.Christ, A.Kiselev, *Maximal functions associated with filtrations*, J. Funct. Anal. **179** (2001), 409–425.

[C1] S.Cuccagna, *A revision of "On asymptotic stability in energy space of ground states of NLS in 1D"*, http://arxiv.org/abs/0711.4192.

[C2] ______, *Dispersion for Schrödinger equation with periodic potential in 1D*, Communications PDE **33** (2008), 2064 2095.

[C3] ______, *Stability of standing waves for NLS with perturbed Lamé potential*, J. Differential Equations **223** (2006), 112–160.

[C4] ______, *Stabilization of solutions to nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, Comm. Pure App. Math. **54** (2001), 1110–1145.

[C5] ______, *On asymptotic stability of ground states of NLS*, Rev. Math. Phys. **15** (2003), 877–903.

[C6] ______, *On instability of excited states of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, Physica D **238** (2009), 38–54.

[C7] ______, *On asymptotic stability in energy space of ground states of NLS in 1D*, J. Differential Equations **245** (2008), 653-691.

[CM] S.Cuccagna, T.Mizumachi, *On asymptotic stability in energy space of ground states for Nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, http://arxiv.org/.

[CT] S.Cuccagna, M.Tarulli, *On asymptotic stability in energy space of ground states of NLS in 2D*, http://arxiv.org/abs/0801.1277.

[CPV] S.Cuccagna, D.Pelinovsky, V.Vougalter, *Spectra of positive and negative energies in the linearization of the NLS problem*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **58** (2005), 1–29.

[CV] S.Cuccagna, N.Visciglia, *Scattering for small energy solutions of NLS with periodic potential in 1D*, http://arxiv.org/abs/0808.3454.

[DT] P.Deift, E.Trubowitz, *Inverse scattering on the line*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **32** (1979), 121–251.

[FK] S.Fassari, M.Klaus, *Coupling constant thresholds of perturbed periodic Hamiltonians*, J. Math. Phys. **39** (1998), 4369–4416.

[F1] N.Firsova, *On the time decay of a wave packet in a one-dimensional finite band periodic lattice*, J. Math. Phys. **37** (1996), 1171–1181.

[F2] ———, *A direct and inverse scattering problem for a one-dimensional perturbed Hill operator*, Math. USSR-Sb. **58** (1987), 351–388.

[GH] T.Gallay, M.Haragus, *Stability of small periodic waves for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation*, J. Diff. Equations **234** (2007), 544–581.

[GV] J.Ginibre, G.Velo, *Time decay of finite energy solutions of the nonlinear Klein Gordon and Schrödinger equations*, Annales Inst. H. Poincaré A **43** (1985), 399–442.

[GNT] S.Gustafson, K.Nakanishi, T.P.Tsai, *Asymptotic Stability and Completeness in the Energy Space for Nonlinear Schrödinger Equations with Small Solitary Waves*, Int. Math. Res. Notices **66** (2004), 3559–3584.

[GS1] Zhou Gang, I.M.Sigal, *Asymptotic stability of nonlinear Schrödinger equations with potential*, Rev. Math. Phys. **17** (2005), 1143–1207.

[GS2] ———, *Relaxation of Solitons in Nonlinear Schrödinger Equations with Potential*, Advances in Math. **216** (2007), 443-490.

[GSS] M.Grillakis, J.Shatah, W.Strauss, *Stability of solitary waves in the presence of symmetries, I*, Jour. Funct. An. **74** (1987), 160–197.

[KM] E.Kirr, Ö. Mizrak, *On the asymptotic stability of bound states in 3D cubic Scrödinger equation including subcritical cases*, http://arxiv.org/abs/0803.3377.

[KZ1] E.Kirr, A.Zarnescu, *On the asymptotic stability of bound states in 2D cubic Scrödinger equation*, Comm. Math. Phys. **272** (2007), 443–468.

[KZ2] ———, *On the asymptotic stability of bound states in 2D cubic Scrödinger equation including subcritical cases*, http://arxiv.org/abs/0805.3888.

[K] E.Korotyaev, *The propagation of the waves in periodic media at large time*, Math. Asymptot. Anal. **15** (1997), 1–24.

[M1] T.Mizumachi, *Asymptotic stability of small solitons to 1D NLS with potential*, Jour. of Math. Kyoto University **48** (2008), 471-497.

[M2] ———, *Asymptotic stability of small solitons for 2D Nonlinear Schrödinger equations with potential*, Jour. of Math. Kyoto University **43** (2007), 599-620.

[P] G.Perelman, *Asymptotic stability of solitons for nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, Comm. in PDE **29** (2004), 1051–1095.

[PW] C.A.Pillet, C.E.Wayne, *Invariant manifolds for a class of dispersive, Hamiltonian partial differential equations*, J. Diff. Eq. **141** (1997), 310–326.

[RSS] I.Rodnianski, W.Schlag, A.Soffer, *Asymptotic stability of N-soliton states of NLS*, preprint, 2003, http://arxiv.org/abs/math.AP/0309114.

[ShS] J.Shatah, W.Strauss, *Instability of nonlinear bound states*, Comm. Math. Phys. **100** (1985), 173–190.

[SmS] H.F.Smith, C.D.Sogge, *Global Strichartz estimates for nontrapping perturbations of the Laplacian*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **25** (2000), 2171–2183.

[SW1] A.Soffer, M.Weinstein, *Multichannel nonlinear scattering for nonintegrable equations*, Comm. Math. Phys. **133** (1990), 116–146.

[SW2] ———, *Multichannel nonlinear scattering II. The case of anisotropic potentials and data*, J. Diff. Eq. **98** (1992), 376–390.

[SW3] ———, *Resonances, radiation damping and instability in Hamiltonian nonlinear wave equations*, Invent. Math. **136** (1999), 9–74.

[SW4] ———, *Selection of the ground state for nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, Rev. Math. Phys. **16** (2004), 977–1071.

[SK] A. Stefanov, P.G.Kevrekidis, *Asymptotic behaviour of small solutions for the discrete nonlinear Schrödinger and Klein–Gordon equations*, Nonlinearity **18** (2005), 1841–1857.

[Str] W.Strauss, *Nonlinear wave equations*, CBMS Regional Conf. Ser. Mat. 76, AMS, 1989, pp. 173–190.

[TY1] T.P.Tsai, H.T.Yau, *Asymptotic dynamics of nonlinear Schrödinger equations: resonance dominated and radiation dominated solutions*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **55** (2002), 153–216.

[TY2] ———, *Relaxation of excited states in nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, Int. Math. Res. Not. **31** (2002), 1629–1673.

[TY3] ———, *Classification of asymptotic profiles for nonlinear Schrödinger equations with small initial data*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **6** (2002), 107–139.

[Wd1] R. Weder, *Center manifold for nonintegrable nonlinear Schrödinger equations on the line*, Comm. Math. Phys. **170** (2000), 343–356.

[Wd2] ———, *$L^p \to L^{p'}$ estimates for the Schrödinger equation on the line and inverse scattering for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation with a potential*, J. Funct. Anal. **170** (2000), 37–68.

[We1] M.Weinstein, *Lyapunov stability of ground states of nonlinear dispersive equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **39** (1986), 51–68.

[We2] ———, *Modulation stability of ground states of nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, Siam J. Math. Anal. **16** (1985), 472–491.

DISMI University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, via Amendola 2, Padiglione Morselli, Reggio Emilia 42100 Italy
E-mail address: `cuccagna.scipio@unimore.it`

Dipartimento di Matematica "L. Tonelli", University of Pisa, Largo B. Pontecorvo 5, 56127 Pisa, Italy
E-mail address: `viscigli@dm.unipi.it`